The Communist

20c MARCH 1944

Copy A

PARTISANSHIP—A LUXURY AMERICA CANNOT AFFORD!

EARL BROWDER

•

ORDER OF THE DAY

JOSEPH STALIN

•

THE SOVIET NATIONS AND TEHERAN

JAMES S. ALLEN

•

ON THE STUDY OF BROWDER'S REPORT

DAVID GOLDWAY

•

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE TO CONGRESS

MAX GORDON

•

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY, 1944

ELIZABETH GURLEY FLYNN

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Books on the Soviet Union

VLADIMIR LENIN
A Political Biography

Prepared by the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute of the U.S.S.R., this new definitive study of the founder and leader of the Soviet Union constitutes in many essential respects a history of the socialist revolution of 1917 which gave birth to the mighty Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and an exposition of Lenin's social, economic and political theories which guided it to power.

Price $1.90

The Red Army

By Prof. I. Minz

The history and organization of the Red Army and a record of its achievements from its foundation up to the epic victory at Stalingrad.

Price $1.25

Soviet Economy and the War

By Maurice Dobb

A factual record of economic developments during the last few years with special reference to their bearing on the Soviet war potential.

Paper $.25; Cloth $1.00

Soviet Planning and Labor in Peace and War

By Maurice Dobb

Economic planning, the financial system, work, wages, the economic effects of the war, and other special aspects of the Soviet economic system prior to and during the war.

Paper $.35; Cloth $1.00

The Secret of Soviet Strength

By Hewlett Johnson, Dean of Canterbury

The sources and challenge of Soviet economic, political and military might, described by the author of the best-selling book, **The Soviet Power.**

Paper $.35; Cloth $1.50

•

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOL. XXIII, No. 3 MARCH, 1944

THE COMMUNIST

A MAGAZINE OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM-LENINISM

EDITOR: EARL BROWDER

CONTENTS

Partisanship — a Luxury America Cannot Afford!	*Earl Browder*	195
Order of the Day	*Joseph Stalin*	201
The Soviet Nations and Teheran	*James S. Allen*	206
The Significance of the Teheran Decisions		217
Report to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.	*Vyacheslav M. Molotov*	223
On the Study of Browder's Report	*David Goldway*	232
The President's Message to Congress	*Max Gordon*	241
International Women's Day, 1944	*Elizabeth Gurley Flynn*	252
Teheran and the Negro People	*James W. Ford*	260
The I.L.G.W.U. at the Crossroads	*Rose Wortis*	267
National Unity and the Farmers	*Fred Briehl*	275
Plans for Currency Stabilization	*Eugene Varga*	282
Japanese - German Relations During the Second World War	*A. Zhukov*	284

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. THE COMMUNIST is published Monthly by Workers Library Publishers, Inc., at 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y. (mail address, P. O. Box 148, Station D), to whom subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate: $2.00 a year; $1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada $2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PAMPHLETS ON THE WAR

Teheran and America, by Earl Browder	$.05
Moscow, Cairo, Teheran, by Earl Browder	.05
Farmers in 1944, by Charles J. Coe	.10
Shall the Communist Party Change Its Name? by Earl Browder, Eugene Dennis, Roy Hudson and John Williamson	.03
Soviet Trade Unions and Allied Labor Unity, by William Z. Foster	.05
A Talk About the Communist Party, by Earl Browder	.03
Jewish Unity For Victory, by Alexander Bittelman	.10
The Path Dimitroff Charted, by V. J. Jerome	.05
We Will Join Hands With Russia on Polish-Soviet Relations	05
The 16 Soviet Republics: Molotov's Speech to the Supreme Soviet	.03
The War of National Liberation, by Joseph Stalin, in two parts Each	.15
The Soviet Union — A Family of Nations	.10
Organized Labor in the Soviet Union, by Edwin S. Smith	.10
George Dimitroff, with an introduction by Earl Browder	.10

•

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PARTISANSHIP—A LUXURY AMERICA CANNOT AFFORD!

BY EARL BROWDER

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT, in his message to Congress on January 11, reported on the historic conferences of October and November which culminated in the concord of Teheran. He said:

"The one supreme objective for the future, which we discussed for each nation individually, and for all the United Nations, can be summed up in one word: Security. And that means not only physical security which provides safety from attacks by aggressors. It means also economic security, social security, moral security—in a family of nations."

The program of Teheran is the only possible road by which the world can reach security through victory and a stable peace.

One should expect that the mighty newspaper press of America would have carried to our people some systematic elucidation of this mighty, far-reaching, history-changing character of the concord of Teheran. But nothing of the kind has taken place. Instead of this, our great metropolitan daily papers with their tens of millions of circulation every day have in their great majority deliberately campaigned to hide, distort, and misrepresent the Teheran program. The minority of papers which have not done so are, however, not campaigning in favor of Teheran, but are a mess of confusion, opening their columns with equal hospitality to the most vicious slanders of Teheran as well as to honest attempts to understand and explain Teheran.

This failure of the chief instrument of public intelligence, of most of the press, to function in full support of our nation's war policy, is one of the greatest threats against our war effort, one of the greatest obstacles to victory.

Many of our newspapers print Adolf Hitler's speeches in full, just as they print President Roosevelt's —and then in their editorial columns and in the slant they give to the news some of them give more support to Hitler's line than they give to our President's.

It is a sad fact that Adolf Hitler still has more influence in guiding the thought of many of our American newspapers than has our own Commander-in-Chief. And it is a sad commentary on the vigilance of our nation that we allow the pro-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fascist newspaper axis of the McCormicks, Hearsts and Pattersons to spread Hitler's poison and to plump for a negotiated peace.

Berlin's propaganda line today drives toward one supreme goal—to weaken the alliance between Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and America, and eventually to split it. That is the one remaining hope of Hitler.

The Teheran concord answered this by proclaiming that the Allies will work together in the war and in the peace that will follow, envisaging that victory over the Axis will banish the scourge of war from the world for generations to come.

Read your newspapers every day with this question in your mind: Which leading thought has guided the writers who produced the paper, that of Berlin or that of Teheran?

If the newspapers really represented America, then our cause would be hopeless, for many of them clearly lean more to Berlin than to Teheran.

Fortunately, we already know from past experience that most of the newspapers do not represent the American people, who are as overwhelmingly in support of President Roosevelt as the newspapers are opposed to him. But the American people must learn how to recognize and reject Hitler's mental poison that comes to them every day in numerous American newspapers.

* * *

There exists in the United States an ideology fostered by many newspapers and some other pro-fascist circles, which holds that eventually, and the sooner the better, the United States must go to war against the Soviet Union in order to destroy its social and economic system because it is different from ours.

This anti-Soviet ideology is Hitler's secret weapon in America. It is toward this that he directs his short-wave propaganda broadcasts to our continent. It is this un-American and anti-United Nations propaganda that is spread by the Hearsts and the *Chicago Tribune*.

The recent meeting of the National Committee of the Communist Party of the United States proposed several new features of policy which have been widely commented upon —and misrepresented—by the press of the nation. A complete exposition and explanation of these policies is published in a forty-eight page pamphlet entitled *Teheran and America*, which is available to everyone at the nominal cost of five cents.

It will facilitate an understanding of the views and proposals of American Communists, if they are examined from the beginning as proposals directed single-mindedly to the destruction of Hitlerism and the Axis, and the victory of our country as a part of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition leading the United Nations.

A gentleman recently, in commenting upon the new policies of the Communists, remarked to me: "I can understand your policy as one designed solely for winning the war; but I don't understand what, as a result, has become of Marxism."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I answered him that I was glad he understood what was necessary to win the war, but that I was sorry he misunderstood Marxism as a theory of how to lose the war.

Marxism, the body of theoretical principles which brings science into the service of the political advancement of mankind, undertakes to guide and facilitate human progress. It is a fact that the problem of how to win this present war is still the supreme problem for all future progress of mankind. If Marxism were indifferent to this problem, and even more if Marxism were an obstacle rather than a help in solving it, then the gentleman who spoke to me could indeed raise the question what has become of Marxism! But when, instead, Marxism comes forward as the clearest, boldest, most effective explanation of the problems of winning this war, and the Marxists come forward as the leading mobilizers and organizers of the masses for that purpose—then there is no question of what has become of Marxism, for it has passed the severest tests of life and proved itself.

The Marxists of America were able to understand the significance of the Teheran concord, and its consequences, more quickly and deeply than any other organized political mass organization in the country, precisely because our scientific training in Marxism had prepared us for the most complicated and difficult problems of social and political transformation.

Some persons, long inured to the anarchistic tendencies that dominate too many intellectual circles which make a virtue of lack of agreement and of multiple answers to all questions, profess to find the Communists an alien and un-American body because of our unanimity of political views. In this they see an absence of thinking among the members, who, supposedly, take their opinions ready made from an all-powerful political apparatus.

Such a caricature is, of course, the opposite of the truth. Communists as a body do more intensive thinking than any comparable political group, and discuss and decide their problems more democratically. That is the very foundation of our unanimity.

This character of the Communist organization receives its fullest confirmation when we find that, even without the opportunities of consultation and discussion, individual Communists under the most diverse conditions and widely dispersed geographically, come to identical conclusions about the world situation. I think you will find as interesting as I did, the following example which has just come to my attention.

An American Communist, who has been over two years away from home in the U.S. Army, is now somewhere in the Far Pacific, some eight or ten thousand miles away. On January 8, the same day our National Committee was meeting in New York, he wrote a letter to his wife in which he included some political conclusions to which his isolated thinking about the world situation had led him. His conclusions were identical with the basic thesis of our National Committee

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

meeting. Permit me to quote his exact words:

"The change in world history brought about by the Moscow, Cairo, and Teheran Conferences poses a whole number of new practical and theoretical questions. The kind of world there will be after this war (already in its early stages) is so completely different from that of 1918! The determining factor of world politics is now and will be, the long-time collaboration (now in war, later in peace) of the greatest capitalist nations with the Socialist ones, as distinct from the hostile encirclement of 1918. It will be a world in which the most decayed and reactionary elements of capitalism will have been decisively defeated, and in which the most democratic sections were able to survive only with the help of the socialist nations, and through the advancement of formerly-oppressed colonial peoples towards greater independence and consolidation as free nations. It will be a world in which governments of a new type, neither capitalist nor socialist in the old sense, will come into being. All this means that every old theory has to be re-studied again and that many new ones are presented for solution. Plenty of room for creative thought and action! There will be no lack of things for us soldiers to do once we get through fighting and come home. Never a dull moment!"

Of course, in real life absolutes do not exist, and the unanimity of the Communists is not absolute. In every great crisis or historical turning point, we always find a few who have stopped thinking, who have become welded to old formulas, or who, for various particular reasons, find themselves diverted out of the main stream of historical development into stagnant backwaters. They are the exceptions that prove the general rule.

The vast majority of our people in America cannot be united for the great task of victory in this war and the post-war reconstruction of the world, through participation in the process of Marxian thinking. When we turn to the vast and complicated problem of uniting the effective majority of the American people behind the program of Teheran, we must understand to the full that the Marxists are numerically one of the smallest political parties in our country. And the country is by no means turning to Marxism or socialism or communism. Nor will it do so in the predictable future if the program of Teheran is successfully carried out, if a catastrophic aftermath to this war is avoided.

* * *

Whether the promise of Teheran will be realized or not depends to a considerable extent, insofar as Americans can influence the decision, in the first place upon the outcome of the 1944 elections. There are strong and powerful pro-fascist forces in our country who are the sworn enemies of everything for which Teheran stands. In the national elections these forces are preparing a desperate attempt to seize the direction of our country for the purpose of turning it away from Teheran, and toward a new world war after the present one is finished.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

President Roosevelt is the only political figure in our country whose election next November would constitute a guarantee that the policy of Teheran would guide our country in the ensuing four years. But it is my opinion that if Americans wish Roosevelt to accept the nomination it will be necessary to assure him in advance that the people are rising above all partisan considerations, that they are uniting behind his policies so strongly, that without any diversion of his major attention from the tasks of the war his re-election is practically assured.

That is my opinion. But it is an opinion based upon the fact, which every intelligent man knows, that while our country needs Roosevelt at the helm in the next four years, it does not need and cannot afford to have Roosevelt as an unsuccessful candidate in 1944. Our country needs above all a stable policy in its foreign relations, it needs the feeling and atmosphere of stability, it needs to have the policy of Teheran, adopted by the whole country in its overwhelming majority regardless of partisan alignments—therefore it needs Roosevelt, not as a partisan, but as a national leader in the broadest sense.

Yesterday was the anniversary of the great Lincoln. This raises before us the inevitable parallel between 1944 and 1864. Eighty years ago, Abraham Lincoln faced problems which in many respects were similar to those faced by Roosevelt today. He faced an unfinished war of survival for our country; he faced a hostile Congressional majority made up of a coalition of special interests, prejudices, and defeatism, which reached deep into his own party; he faced the necessity of winning a national election without partisanship, by rising above party lines, and yet without conceding an inch in questions of principle in the struggle against his opposition. That is an accurate description of the situation facing Roosevelt and our country today.

In order to solve the problems of 1944 in the spirit of Lincoln, it will be necessary for patriotic men and women of all parties and all ideologies to rise above their partisan alignments, interests, and ambitions. It will be necessary for them, especially for labor and the working people, to find means of upholding the policies of Teheran, of securing continuity of leadership for our country, of creating a national unity in our country which cannot be threatened by any elections or any subsidiary issues.

That means inevitably that patriotic men and women of all parties and of all people's organizations must unite to convince Roosevelt that the country demands his continued leadership. For if Roosevelt, not seeing sufficient support in the country transcending party lines to guarantee his election without a partisan campaign on his part, should retire from the political scene, then indeed would our country be embarked upon uncharted seas of uncontrolled factionalism at the moment of our deepest national and international crisis.

I have no desire to attack the many aspirants to the Presidency. Their right under our American sys-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tem to forward such an aspiration in a practical way is as unquestionable as the right of labor to strike in protection of its living standards. But just as we urge the patriotic duty of labor not to exercise its right to strike during the war, no matter what the provocation, in exactly the same sense we must urge in the 1944 elections that all patriotic groups and individual aspirants to high position shall subordinate their special interests to the cause of national unity for winning the war and realizing the aims of Teheran. We must urge them to reject partisanship which in 1944 threatens to delay victory in the war and to increase its cost in the lives of our young men at the battlefronts.

Would the prospects of national unity be advanced by one iota, if Roosevelt should announce his retirement?

It is obvious to everyone that such an act by Roosevelt would throw the whole country into turmoil. Even the Republican Party in its most partisan and diehard sections would be completely disoriented by such a development, and far less united on any phase of practical politics before them and the country.

I know I am speaking the thoughts of many millions of American men and women when I thus raise these questions. I am able to speak thus forthrightly, when so many other public figures who think along similar lines keep silent, because my party, the Communist Party, is the only national political organization which has renounced all thought of partisan advancement and completely subordinated all other considerations to the needs of the quickest and most complete victory in the war. Millions of individuals, including leaders among all classes, accept that standard—but they have not yet demanded and secured its adoption by their political organizations.

Narrow partisanship is a luxury which America cannot afford in this year of 1944. It threatens to weaken and even to divert our war effort. It will surely increase the cost of victory, which is counted not only in dollars but in lives. It obscures the glorious promise of Teheran, of a world from which the scourge of war is banished for many generations and in which mankind can work out its destiny in freedom and prosperity. It makes the highest aspirations of our nation and the world into political footballs to be kicked around the arena of a domestic struggle for power to which no restraints have been established. Partisanship in 1944 threatens the future of our nation and of the world.

That is the supreme question of the 1944 elections.

America will ride the storm of this world war, will achieve victory together with its glorious allies, will participate in the reorganization of the world as a family of democratic nations, will achieve the promise of Teheran. America will do this because the working people and the majority of all patriotic citizens, in the spirit of Jefferson and Lincoln, will rise above all old prejudices, group interests, and partisan alignments and will turn the 1944 elections into a great demonstration of national unity.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ORDER OF THE DAY

(On the 26th Anniversary of the Founding of the Red Army, February 23, 1944.)

BY JOSEPH STALIN

COMRADES, Red Army and Navy men, non-commissioned officers, officers, generals, men and women guerrillas!

The peoples of our country are celebrating the twenty-sixth anniversary of the Red Army in situations marked by the historic victories of Soviet troops over the German fascists.

For more than a year the Red Army has been waging a victorious offensive, smashing the armies of the Hitlerite invaders and driving them from Soviet soil. During the said time, the Red Army carried through the successful winter campaign of 1942-43, won the summer battles of 1943 and developed the victorious winter offensive of 1943-44. In these campaigns, unparalleled in the annals of warfare, the Red Army fought its way westward some seventeen hundred kilometers in some places, clearing almost three-fourths of the Soviet territory seized by the enemy.

During the present winter campaign, the Red Army reduced the powerful German defenses right along the Dnieper from Zhlobin to Kherson, thereby destroying the German calculations on successfully waging protracted defensive war on the Soviet-German front.

In three months of the winter campaign, our valiant troops won outstanding victories on the right bank of the Dnieper; completed the liberation of the Kiev, Dnieprope-trovsk, Zaporozhe regions, liberated all of Zhitomir, practically all of Rovno and the Kirovograd regions, a number of districts in the Vinnitsa, Nikolayev, Kamenets-Podolsk and Volynia regions.

The decisive operations of the Red Army put an end to the German attempts at counter-offensive in the Zhitomir, Krivoi Rog and Uman areas. The Soviet troops effected a new Stalingrad for the Germans on the right bank of the Dnieper, encircling and destroying ten German divisions and a brigade in the Korsun Shevchenkovsky area.

A smashing victory was won by the Soviet troops at Leningrad. Our troops breached the powerful network of solid, deeply echeloned enemy fortifications, routed the strong group of German troops and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

completely liberated Leningrad from the enemy blockade and the barbarous artillery bombardments. The Soviet warriors are completing the clearing of the Leningrad-Kalinin regions of the fascist monsters and have entered the territory of Soviet Estonia.

Mass expulsion of the invaders is in progress in Soviet Byelorussia: the Gomel and Polessie regions are almost entirely liberated as well as a number of districts in the Mogilev and Vitebsk regions.

In the adverse conditions of the present winter, overcoming the powerful enemy defense zones, the Soviet troops in three months of the winter campaign cleared of invaders about 200,000 square kilometers of Soviet territory. The Red Army captured from the enemy more than 13,000 inhabited points including 82 towns and 320 railway stations. Additional millions of Soviet citizens were delivered from the fascist yoke. Important agricultural and industrial regions with rich deposits of iron ore and manganese have been restored to our country. The Germans lost these economically important districts to which they clung with such desperation.

It must now be clear to all that Hitler Germany is irresistibly heading for disaster. True, the conditions of waging war in this conflict are more favorable for Germany than was the case in the first World War, when, from the very beginning and to the end of the war she had to fight on two fronts. Nevertheless, Germany's great drawback is the fact that the Soviet Union proved far stronger in this war than the old tsarist Russia was in the last war. During the first World War against Germany's bloc, there fought on two fronts six great powers, France, Russia, Britain, the United States, Japan and Italy. During the present war Italy and Japan went over to Germany's side, Finland joined the fascist bloc, Rumania, which in the last war fought against Germany, deserted to it. Moreover, to this day, Germany's main forces are operating on one front against the Soviet Union. It is a historically known fact that Germany always won a war whenever she fought on one front and, vice versa, lost when obliged to fight on two fronts. In the present war, Germany, although her main forces are fighting on one front against the U.S.S.R., nevertheless not only failed to gain the victory but the powerful blows of the armed forces of the Soviet Union brought her to the brink of catastrophe.

If the Soviet Union, fighting in single combat, not only withstood the onslaught of the German war machine but inflicted decisive defeats on the German fascist troops, all the more hopeless will Hitler Germany's position become when the main forces of our allies will enter the field and the powerful gathering offensive of the armies of all the allied states will develop against Hitler Germany.

The German fascist gangsters are now desperately seeking a way out of catastrophe. They once more seized upon "total" mobilization at home although Germany's manpower resources are exhausted. The

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fascist chieftains are making desperate attempts to sow discord in the camp of the anti-Hitlerite coalition and thereby prolong the war. Hitlerite diplomats are rushing from one neutral country to another trying to make contacts with pro-Hitlerite elements, hinting at the possibility of a separate peace now with our state, now with our allies. All these maneuvers of the Hitlerites are doomed to failure, for at the basis of the anti-Hitlerite coalition are the vitally important interests of the allies who have set the task of defeating Hitlerite Germany and her associates in Europe. Precisely this community of basic interests makes for the strengthening of the fighting alliance of the U.S.S.R., Britain, and the United States in the course of the war.

The hour of the final reckoning for all the crimes perpetrated by the Hitlerites on Soviet territory and the occupied countries of Europe is approaching.

The Red Army's victorious offensive became possible thanks to the new feats of labor heroism of the Soviet people in all branches of our national economy. The working people of the Soviet Union reinforced the Red Army's summer victories on the fronts with new production victories in the rear. The workers of our industry are fulfilling and overfulfilling the state plans ahead of schedule—putting new factories, blast furnaces and electric power stations into operation, restoring in unprecedentedly short space of time the industry of the liberated areas destroyed by the invaders. The heroic efforts of the working class still further are strengthening the military material base of the Red Army, thus hastening the hour of our final victory.

The Soviet peasantry is supplying the state with provisions for the army and the towns raw materials for industry, rendering selfless support to the Red Army.

The Soviet intelligentsia is rendering direct, guiding assistance to the workers and peasants in developing production and satisfying the needs of the Red Army. With every passing day the working people of the liberated districts are increasing their help to the Red Army, their liberator, adding to the general stream of supplies moving to the front the output of restored plants and agriculture.

There is no doubt whatsoever that the Soviet people by their heroic labor and the exertion of all their efforts will continue to ensure the steady increase of the productive forces of the country for the speedy and final rout of the German fascist invaders.

The formation of new army units in the Union Republics, prepared by the fighting companionship of peoples of the U.S.S.R. in the patriotic war and entire history of our state, will still further strengthen the Red Army and add new fighting forces to its ranks.

Comrades, Red Army and Navy men, non-commissioned officers, officers and generals, partisans, men and women! You have displayed prodigies of valor in the great liberation war for the freedom and independence of our motherland. The Red Army has effected a decisive turning point in the war in our favor and today is confidently

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

marching onward to final victory over the enemy. The enemy is suffering defeat after defeat. However, he is not yet vanquished. The Hitlerite plunderers, sensing their approaching doom and the inevitability of their retribution for all the monstrous crimes committed by them on our soil, are resisting with the desperation of the doomed. They are throwing their last forces and reserves into battle, clinging to every yard of Soviet soil, to every vantage point.

Precisely for this reason we must continue, no matter how great our victories, soberly to estimate the enemy's strength, to be vigilant and not permit conceit, complacency or negligence in our ranks. The history of wars has never known the enemy to jump into the abyss of his own accord. In order to win the war, the enemy must be driven to the precipice and pushed over. Only crushing blows, steadily growing in intensity, can smash the resistance of the enemy and bring us to final victory. To achieve this it is necessary to continue to perfect the military training of the men and the military skill of the commanders of our army. It is the duty of the Red Army daily to improve its fighting skill, to study the enemy's tactics tirelessly and thoroughly, to see through his strategy skilfully and in good time to oppose the enemy's tactics with our more perfected tactics. It is necessary that the fighting experience and achievements of the foremost units and formations of the Red Army be made accessible to all our troops, that the entire Red Army, all its officers and men, learn to strike at the enemy according to the rules of modern military science.

Comrades, men, non-commissioned officers and generals of the Red Army and Red Navy; partisans, men and women!

In greeting you and congratulating you on the occasion of the twenty-sixth anniversary of the Red Army I hereby order:

1. All men and non-commissioned officers—infantrymen, mortar crews, artillerymen, airmen, tank crews, sappers, liaison troops, cavalrymen—ceaselessly to improve their fighting efficiency, to avail themselves fully of our splendid fighting equipment, to rout the enemy the way he is being routed by our glorious guardsmen, strictly to obey the orders of the commanders, to strengthen discipline and order, and to raise the state of their organization.

2. Officers and generals of all arms of the service—to improve their skill in leading troops on the battlefield, in tactics of maneuvers, coordination of all arms of service in battle, boldly and widely to introduce into fighting practice the experience of the leading Guards units and formations, to raise the work of headquarters and the army rear services to a high level, to improve and develop our reconnaissance in every way.

3. The entire Red Army—to smash the enemy's defenses in all their depth by skilful coordination of fire operations and maneuver, to give the enemy no respite, completely to frustrate the enemy's attempts to stem our offensive by counter-attacks, skilfully to organize the pursuit of the enemy and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prevent him from evacuating equipment, to envelop the flanks of the enemy troops in bold maneuvers, to penetrate into their rear, encircle the enemy troops, isolate and destroy them if they refuse to lay down arms.

4. Partisans, men and women—to increase assistance to the Red Army, to attack headquarters and garrisons of the enemy, to rout his rear, destroy his communication lines and prevent him from bringing up reserves.

5. In commemoration of the great victories won by the armed forces of the Soviet state in the past year, to salute the valiant troops of the Red Army with twenty artillery salvoes today, February 23, at 6 P.M. in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Dniepropetrovsk, Gomel, and Rostov.

Glory to our victorious Red Army!

Glory to Soviet arms!

Glory to our courageous partisans, men and women!

Long live our great Soviet Motherland!

Long live our Communist Party of the Soviet Union, inspirer and organizer of the great victories of the Red Army!

Death to the German invaders!

Supreme Commander in Chief,
Marshal of the Soviet Union,

J. STALIN

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SOVIET NATIONS AND TEHERAN

BY JAMES S. ALLEN

THE new constitutional changes approved by the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R. open new channels for extending and strengthening mutual confidence and friendship between the Soviet Union and all United Nations in war and for the peace. The extension of the rights of the Soviet Union republics in defense and foreign relations reveals the virility and dynamism of the Soviet Union. In the midst of a gigantic war, in which the life of all nations is at stake, the Soviet Union opens new vistas for the further growth of nations and their friendly coexistence. As Molotov has said, the peoples of East and West will now come to realize even more fully the great world meaning of the existence of the Soviet Union.

The right to form an army and to establish foreign relations is a high level of national autonomy and freedom. It takes place on the firm foundation of fraternal unity and inner strength, and leads to the tremendous reinforcing of that foundation.

These changes offer the undeniable evidence that the war against Hitler Germany has resulted in the further growth and strengthening of the Soviet Union and of its component socialist nations. Such evidence we have already seen in the great victories of the Red Army, in the resilience and high performance of the Soviet economy during war and in the unprecedented patriotic unity of the Soviet peoples. We also have convincing evidence of the Soviet Union's strength and of its new leading position in world affairs in the tripartite agreements of the Moscow and Teheran conferences. To these has now been added the evidence of still another vast political achievement, which reveals on another plane the high moral quality of the Soviet system and the great creative ability of its leaders.

The Soviet constitutional changes should be seen against the background of two major developments: the approaching defeat of Hitler Germany and the prospect of establishing an enduring peace arising from the Teheran accord.

The successful withstanding of the impact of the Nazi invasion and the firm retention of the initiative since Stalingrad have proven the Soviet superiority over the mightiest war machine yet let loose against any nation. The experience of this war has shown the world, and reaffirmed for the Soviet peo-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ples, the ability of the U. S. S. R. to defend itself, to preserve its socialist achievements and to become stronger under the most adverse conditions. The greatest by-product of this achievement was to expose the futility and bankruptcy of any policy directed toward destroying or weakening the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The Soviet military success does not take place in a vacuum. The defense of the Soviet Union becomes the pivot of a world war of liberation. The destruction of Hitler's military might on the Soviet front heralds the liberation of the European peoples from Germany and from fascism. The war takes place as a coalition war. Allied with the Soviet Union as leaders of the anti-Hitler coalition are the two strongest capitalist powers in the world: our country and Britain. This coalition overcomes the various stresses and strains working to pull it apart. It becomes firmer in the course of the war.

Historically, this marks for the Soviet Union the end of the period of hostile encirclement. The fascist invader is being defeated. In the common need for survival and defense against the aggressor, in the struggle for the life of nations, a new unity emerges to supersede the striving of world reaction for a common front against the Soviet Union. In Hitler Germany and the Axis the apex of world reaction and counter-revolution was reached. In the anti-Hitler coalition and in the United Nations the forward march of humanity toward progress is resumed.

A great weight has been lifted from the Soviet nations and from their Union. The vast creative energies released by the common war effort among all the peoples of the Soviet Union can now be set to work, free from the threat of extinction. Doors can be flung wide open to the realization of the complete promise of socialist life and to the even fuller flowering of the Soviet freedoms.

But it is not only a question of having broken down the ring of hostility. So important a change in world relations cannot take place without immediately giving shape to a new state of relations. And that was supplied in its main essentials at the Moscow and Teheran conferences. If the successes of the Red Army and the formation of the anti-Hitler coalition provided the guarantee of Hitler's defeat, Teheran offers assurances of the joint ending of the war and the immediate transition to a long period of peace. The Soviet Union and its component socialist nations can now set their course with confidence for many decades ahead, taking such measures as will promote their own free growth, and contribute to the total defeat of fascism and to world security.

The Soviet constitutional changes, therefore, are an outcome of the successful turn to the final and offensive phase of the war. They are also the first major response to Teheran and a vast contribution to the realization of the Teheran peace.

The higher autonomy of the Union Republics, in the midst of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

war, could be achieved because of the solid foundation established by socialism and by the Lenin-Stalin national policy. It is the success of socialist construction and the national policy which accounts for the unbreakable unity between the many soviet nations and national minorities under the test of war. It also explains why each Soviet nation, whether in the direct path of the invader or in the deep rear, was aroused by the war to the highest pitch of national endeavor and patriotism. The general principles of the Soviet national policy and how it operated to raise the economic, political and cultural levels of many nations formerly oppressed and retarded by the Russian rulers under Tsarism are sufficiently well known and need no further exposition here.

In his explanation of the constitutional changes, Molotov stated that they constitute "a new forward stride in the solution of the national problem in the Soviet Union . . . in direct accord with the principles of our Lenin-Stalin national policy." He also declared that the new steps mean that the "Soviet state has reached a new level in its development, turning into a more complex and virile organism."

It is sometimes superficially assumed that the past national development within the Soviet Union and the resulting fraternity of socialist nations had finally solved the national problem. What actually had been solved is made clear in the passage Molotov quotes from a speech by Stalin on the new Soviet Constitution in 1936. As a result of the establishment of socialism and the evolution of the Lenin-Stalin national policy, the hangover from Tsarism of mutual distrust among the nations had disappeared and a feeling of mutual friendship had arisen leading to real fraternal cooperation among peoples within a single Soviet state. "As a result we now have a fully formed multinational socialist state," said Stalin in 1936, "which has stood all tests and whose stability might well be envied by any national state in any part of the world."

That was a vast achievement, which showed its worth and its permanence in the present war. But a basic trait of the Soviet system is its dynamism, its continued growth and increasing vitality. Under the stress of war and the strain of the vast patriotic effort, further changes took place in the conditions and the development of the Soviet nations. Those in the path of the Nazi invasion suffered the horrors of the subjugation and a vast devastation of resources, a condition which gives rise to renewed and fierce patriotism and a powerful impulse for the rapid reunion of their people and the reconstruction of their socialist land.

Other nations, removed from the actual field of battle, but giving fully of their energies and blood, were impelled by the terrific war effort to unprecedented economic and political growth. Some became industrialized over night, as they took over the tasks of production which had formerly been performed in the temporarily subjugated areas. During the discussion on the budget in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Supreme Soviet, a deputy from Uzbekistan told how his Republic had been turned into a powerful arsenal for defense. In the course of the war, the share of heavy industrial output in the Republic's economy increased from 14 per cent to 48.5 per cent, although the output of collective agriculture also increased greatly. This gives an inkling of the high tempo of development in the smaller and relatively less developed national republics and regions. It could take place precisely because the Soviet system places no obstacles in the way of such national growth; it is planned and encouraged.

This internal development, equally swift politically and culturally, combined with the whole favorable turn in the international situation, brings the Soviet development to a new level. New national problems arise, no longer of the previous kind, concerning mainly the relations of the nations within the Soviet Union. The multi-national socialist state is in permanent existence. Not a single Soviet nation has in the past implemented its right to secede nor does any now want to secede from the mighty fraternal union; no outside power can now succeed in splitting off any nation by force from the Soviet Union. But the Soviet nations do now have the opportunity, based on their own greater strength and the growth of the Soviet-United Nations friendship, to meet their economic and cultural needs also by entering into direct relations with foreign states.

This makes for a more complex, but also a more dynamic and flexible organism. But it is characteristic of the Soviet Communists, particularly of Stalin, to take the initiative in facilitating the forward movement of history. The world is now very much in motion; as the military defeat of Hitler Germany draws nearer and the liberation of Europe approaches there will be an even greater tempo and fluidity of change and development. Creative leadership anticipates and helps steer the course of events.

In his speech before the Supreme Soviet, Molotov explained that foreign affairs autonomy is necessitated not only by the internal requirements of the Union Republics. He emphasized that the new autonomy is "also in the interest of the entire cause of the expansion of the international connections and the strengthening of the cooperation of the U. S. S. R. with other states which is of such importance in time of war and which will yield fruit also in the post-war period."

And the decree of the Supreme Soviet which authorizes the constitutional changes declares that they are made "with the aim of widening international connections and strengthening the collaboration of the U. S. S. R. with other states and taking into consideration the growing need of the Union Republics in the establishment of direct relations with foreign states."

This makes it plain enough, and from the highest authority, that the new changes are intended to facilitate the fruition of the Anglo-Soviet-American concord of Teheran, and not to circumvent it. As was to be expected, the Berlin radio and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hitler's friends everywhere immediately attempted to hide their own moral defeat by a new propagandistic venture against Allied unity. They tried to convince those in the West who might still pay them heed that the constitutional changes proved that the Soviet Union wished to extend its "empire" over all Europe and to dominate the world. Outside the usual parroters of the Hitler line, relatively few leaders of public opinion in the camp of national unity swallowed the bait.

In their first reactions, the more unbalanced among the liberals showed considerable bewilderment, panic and fear of what they interpreted as a new "maneuver" of Soviet diplomacy. Max Lerner of *PM,* for example, in his first and heedless comment (later lamely and shamefacedly refurbished) saw nothing but calamity and disaster for United Nations unity in the action of the Supreme Soviet. Not having yet learned to keep his balance when confronted with one Soviet entity, he drew back in dismay at the prospect of having to interpret the actions of sixteen Soviet Republics. Another liberal organ, the New York *Post,* editorially succumbed to the same groundless panic which had seized Lerner. These and others speculated nervously about the presence of sixteen Soviet embassies in Washington, the participation of sixteen Soviet Republics in United Nations councils, in the peace conference, in the postwar organization. Some displayed utter ignorance of the most elementary Soviet realities by comparing the autonomy of the Union Republics to the kind of situation which would result if in our country we should give similar freedom to the forty-eight states!

Fortunately, this distrustful and ignorant reaction was limited almost entirely to some liberal circles, under the influence of Social-Democracy and Trotskyism and to congenital anti-Sovieteers. Even the New York *Times* showed greater perspicacity than *PM,* understanding at least the main reasons for the changes, although it could not resist parading the innate reactionism which is characteristic of that worthy organ. But solid organs of win-the-war opinion, like the New York *Herald Tribune* and the *Times* of London (not to speak of numerous newspapers throughout the country), and leading conservative political commentators like Walter Lippmann, David Lawrence and Dorothy Thompson, did not hesitate to dismiss rather angrily the nonsensical interpretations of the Lerner variety.

Their reactions were in the main positive, accepting in good faith the action of the Supreme Soviet and the explanation by Molotov. Much of what they said is open for discussion and some is to be rejected as inaccurate or mere speculation. But they do agree on a very essential point and it is that the Soviet constitutional changes are based solidly upon the perspective held forth in the Teheran accord.

Now this marks a distinct advance in the general approach of responsible anti-Axis opinion toward the Soviet Union. It is a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

measure of the deep-going change in the approach which dominated for the past two decades—a change which is not only governmental and at the top but which permeates wider sectors of the bourgeoisie. The former disposition to dismiss out-of-hand the official Soviet explanation of policy and to seek hidden meanings and ulterior motives is giving way to a growing confidence and more sympathetic understanding of the base and aims of Soviet diplomacy. This positive attitude is maintained in the face of the rather obvious truth that the constitutional changes result from the greater strength of the Soviet Union, and that their declared purpose is to strengthen the international position of the Union Republics and the Union as a whole.

It is becoming more widely understood that we are aligned with a powerful socialist union of nations, having a great capacity for influencing the course of events and possessing both the firmness and flexibility needed to maintain and to move forward the powerful combination of Teheran. And it is also becoming more widely understood, despite the incapacity of some liberals to get rid of the Trotskyite poison and their own inner confusion, that the Soviet Union is the main state force within the coalition working consistently for the uprooting of fascism in all its forms and for a basically democratic solution in Europe.

It is in this light that some of the immediate international effects of the constitutional changes should be viewed. For the defense and foreign autonomy of the Soviet nations will begin to affect the situation immediately—to hasten the completion of the final phase of the war in Europe and to facilitate the solution of outstanding political problems. The problems of joint victory over Hitler Germany and the problems of post-war collaboration are closely intertwined in the present phase of the war. As events in Italy, Yugoslavia, Finland, Spain and France show most concretely, the application of the principles of the Moscow and Teheran agreements encounters many obstacles which can be overcome only in the political defeat of fascism and its influences. Molotov placed special emphasis upon this point in his report to the Supreme Soviet when he declared:

"The Soviet Union and its Allies are already successfully beating fascism, which imposed this war, are hastening the time of its utter military defeat. But we know that matters should not be restricted to the military defeat of the fascist forces. It is necessary to bring to completion the moral-political defeat of fascism as well."

In the broad political and moral sense, the extending of national autonomy of the Soviet nations at the moment when the liberation of the European peoples from the German subjugation is approaching is a great contribution to the defeat of fascism.

In a very practical sense, the appearance of national army formations on the battlefield and the creation of national foreign commissariats of the Union Republics

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bordering on other European nations will have the effect of stimulating anew the national-liberation struggle in a whole series of countries. Aside from its effect in strengthening the Red Army as a whole, the extension of existing Union Republic army formations and the creation of new ones will also help weld the unity of the Soviet peoples as they are liberated from the enemy yoke. At this writing the Red Army is already fighting in Estonia, in Western Ukrainia and Byelorussia, is drawing closer to Moldavia and awaits only the propitious moment for completing the liberation of the Karelo-Finnish Soviet Republic. There can be no question but that the appearance in these areas of Ukrainian, Byelorussian, Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Karelo-Finnish and Moldavian Red Army divisions will encourage still further the resistance of these peoples to the fascist oppressor and will arouse their national patriotism to a new high pitch.

But the immediate political effects of the Soviet national development go beyond that. A great contribution has been made toward overcoming the effects of the fascist propaganda in Europe and of fascist and Munichite influences at work in Britain and the United States, especially as they are expressed at the moment in the so-called Polish, Baltic and Finnish issues. The solution of these issues in the course of the final phase of the war in Europe will aid in mobilizing all the forces of the Allied nations for the final offensives, will remove as an obstacle to anti-fascist unity the still powerful remnants of the old policies of appeasement and anti-Soviet encirclement, and will deprive the defeatist and pro-fascist forces in Britain and especially in our country of still another pretext for their disruptive work.

The foundation for the solution of these questions is being established by the advance of the Red Army and by the anti-Hitler liberation struggle of the peoples in these countries. Two powerful Polish divisions advancing together with the Red Army into Poland will have a greater effect upon the Polish people than tons of manifestoes and apologias issued by the emigré Polish Cabinet in London. And the actual events of the liberation of Poland, including the actions of the people of Poland, will complete the exposure of that non-representative and fascist-influenced group of would-be usurpers who figure in the London Polish Cabinet.

But it is also very necessary to understand that the Soviet state changes advance the immediate and long-range solution of these questions in such a fashion as to give greater content and immediate reality to the general concord reached at Teheran. Soviet policy is providing a bridge over which the United Nations can march safely from the final phase of the war to a general system of post-war security. Such a bridge cannot stand for long if any of its pillars are sunk into the morass of fascist, reactionary, and Munichite hangovers in a Europe liberated from German military domination. This means that governments similar to the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

combination of forces in the Polish Cabinet, in the Helsinki fascist-Social-Democratic regime, in the various anti-Soviet groupings of Baltic refugees, in the Quisling Governments of Hitler's satellite states in the Balkans should never be permitted to recur in Europe.

* * *

The granting of greater autonomy to the Union Republics provides a further guarantee of security for the Soviet nations and the non-Soviet nations which border upon them. This is not to say that the handling of foreign relations by a single All-Union Commissariat has in the past proved an obstacle to the establishment of friendly relations with the neighboring and smaller non-Soviet nations. The twenty-year Treaty of Amity just concluded between the Benes government of Czechoslovakia and the All-Union Soviet government demonstrates how cordial, dignified and equal relations can be formed between a small independent non-Soviet nation and the U.S.S.R. And it also shows that the Soviet Union has no opposition in principle to concluding long-range treaties of friendship with such governments-in-exile which have excluded pro-fascist influences and which are representative of the people.

At the same time it is apparent that the Ukrainian and Byelorussian Soviet republics, which border directly on Poland and in the case of the former also on Czechoslovakia, can even more effectively enter into closer relations of friendship with their neighbors based upon their common needs of security, post-war reconstruction and cultural development. Similarly, the special needs of security in the Baltic area involve directly the Soviet Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Karelo-Finnish and Russian federative republics, which need to assure friendly relations with the Baltic non-Soviet nations.

The regional tasks of security along the Soviet Union's vast frontiers in Europe and Asia are many. And they vary from one region to another, in their political, economic and cultural aspects in the Far East, the Middle East and Europe. With the over-all policy well established, the foreign affairs autonomy of the Union Republics—all of them bordering on non-Soviet nations—permits greater flexibility in the solution of the multitudinous problems of national growth and security.

Some commentators express anxiety because, they claim, the new Soviet national development indicates a "unilateral" policy of security as opposed to a four-power policy. By this they mean to say that the Soviet Union is taking advantage of its greater strength and its newly enhanced world prestige to seek Soviet domination at the expense of world security and in contravention of the accord of Teheran.

Only perennial distrusters of Soviet motives can find a contradiction between security anywhere along the Soviet borders and world security. Who if not the Soviet Union is to have the first concern for looking after the security of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its component nations? We, certainly, would not delegate our right to look after the immediate regional security of the United States to another power or combination of powers. We would deeply resent any intervention by another power in the affairs of Mexico or Canada directed against our country's security (one of the reasons we are at war with the Axis is its anti-U. S. intervention in the Western Hemisphere). And no one can correctly accuse the United States of circumventing the Teheran accord because it refused to recognize the pro-fascist regime of Bolivia and by its pressure forced the Ramirez government of Argentina to break relations with the Axis. On the contrary, such actions are universally hailed as a contribution to the fight against fascism and to the unity of the United Nations.

The establishment of a working security in any part of the world, based on the destruction of fascism and the free self-determination of nations, is one of the best guarantees there can be of a world security system. This is especially true with respect to the Soviet Union, which since the first World War has had to defend itself against the machinations of hostile states along most of its borders. Only an abysmal fool expects that the Soviet Union can or will permit a return to that state of affairs. And it is as much in the American interest as it is in the interests of the Soviet Union and the other United Nations to close once and for all that shameful chapter of world history which led to Hitler's rise to power and to the present war.

In helping to establish security between the Soviet Union and her neighbors we shall be taking the most important step toward world security; for antagonism against the Soviet Union has been the main cause of war during the past quarter century.

Finally, to argue that regional security is a contradiction of world security is the same as saying that an enduring peace is impossible. World security has no meaning unless it is realized concretely in very earthly and specific geographical areas. World security has no meaning in the clouds; it has to be brought down to earth.

It is sometimes said that the Soviet Union is inconsistent, inasmuch as she resents Anglo-American interference in the affairs of Eastern Europe while herself wanting to participate in the solution of the problems of Italy and Western Europe. This analogy cannot hold water. The real question is what kind of "interference" and for what purpose. Our government's continued recognition of the Helsinki regime, Britain's encouragement of the Polish Cabinet, Secretary Hull's offer of mediation on the Polish issue, the continued Anglo-American recognition of the pre-Soviet and fascist governments of Estonia-Latvia-Lithuania, the tardy and incomplete recognition of the Yugoslav Liberation Army are some of the examples of Anglo-American interference in Eastern Europe. Unfortunately, those examples still remain predominant, carrying over pre-Teheran policies and indicating

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a political and diplomatic lag in Anglo-American policy.

On the other hand, what is the nature of the Soviet "interference" in Western Europe? Its representative on the Italian Advisory Council presses merely for the application of the tri-partite declaration of foreign ministers, which pledges the three powers to eradicate fascism in Italy and to recognize the anti-fascist front of the Italian people. The Soviet Government was the first to grant full recognition to the French Committee of National Liberation, a step which Britain and America are only now preparing to take. With respect to Spain, the Soviet Union consistently exposed Franco's aid to Hitler, and only recently Anglo-American policy began to exert some pressure upon the fascist government of Spain, which it still hopes to "neutralize." As can be seen, Soviet "interference" in Western Europe is for the purpose of helping mobilize all our Allies for the war against Hitler Germany and has the aim of realizing the principles adopted by Stalin, Roosevelt and Churchill at Teheran.

* * *

The new forward movement of national freedom within the Soviet Union shows the inner vitality, the further growth and the strength of the union of socialist nations. But the new constitutional changes also serve to set at rest fears which may exist among some circles that the tremendous power of the Soviet Union will be used for anti-national and anti-democratic purposes. In the hands of Hitler Germany vast power meant the domination of Europe and the destruction of national freedom. In the hands of the Soviet Union, great power is subordinated to, and made the instrument of a policy for destroying fascism, assuring a stable peace and advancing the freedom of nations.

As many have already remarked, decentralization such as is involved in the present Soviet changes certainly cannot be interpreted as a sign of aggressive intentions. It indicates just the opposite, the intention of the Soviet Union to make it easier for its neighbors and its allies to enter into comfortable and friendly relations with the Soviet nations. In his comment, Walter Lippmann expressed this feeling with respect to American-Soviet relations when he remarked that the new constitutional changes would result in "a more comfortable political system to deal with." (*Herald Tribune*, Feb. 3, 1944.)

The Soviet state changes also provide bold assurances of a peaceful and constructive solution of the many complex problems of the post-war reconstruction of Europe. This aspect of the question is also well understood by broad circles in this country. The New York *Herald Tribune*, for example, said editorially:

"As the bloody Nazi attempt to organize Eastern Europe begins to crumble it must leave a vacuum behind it which in the last analysis can only be filled by Russia. . . . Last week President Benes of Czechoslovakia not only recognized the fact, but he welcomed Russia's readiness to assume responsibility

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as a positive, constructive development in European history. It was the view of an experienced and an astute statesman." (Feb. 7, 1944.)

In some circles, where fear of socialism predominates, alarm was expressed at Molotov's statement that the Soviet national developments will "reveal a still further historic meaning of the existence of the Soviet Union to the peoples of East and West."

To this expression of alarm, Dorothy Thompson gave a confident reply:

"The Soviet Union has entered into open competition, by open diplomacy, for a focal position as the magnet of Europe and Asia. If the western powers should think to answer this by force, they would be misled. Force has absolute limits in this world. Or if they think to answer it by letting nature take its course, I fear they will find that a planless world is at great disadvantage with one which has a clear conception. The only possible answer is a western plan more attractive to the peoples." (New York *Post,* Feb. 7, 1944.)

Whichever plan the future may approve, we can have great confidence that a period now opens in which the military and political defeat of fascism will usher in a new upsurge of democratic and national freedoms. The Soviet Union offers evidence of that. Its actions serve as a stimulus to all nations and to all peoples. And the three-power concord of Teheran provides guarantees that major obstacles to the freedom of nations can be swept aside. It is the fate of the men of this generation to destroy fascist reaction and to resume humanity's forward march.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE TEHERAN DECISIONS*

THE historical decisions of the Teheran Conference hold the center of attention of world opinion. The Teheran Conference came up to the expectations of the freedom-loving nations. At the same time, its results surpassed the worst fears of our enemies—the Hitlerites and their hirelings, their accomplices and their agents of all shades.

The road leading to the Teheran meeting was no easy one, and a number of obstacles had to be surmounted. It was prepared by the strengthening of the fighting alliance and the friendly cooperation between the Soviet Union, Britain and the United States.

The alliance of the three greatest contemporary powers came into being and was developed in the joint struggle against the common enemy, Hitlerite Germany. In the fire of this great liberation struggle, many barriers which were standing in its way were destroyed.

The Moscow Conference of the three foreign ministers greatly strengthened the Anglo-Soviet-American fighting partnership in war and for the peace which is to follow.

The Teheran Conference summarized the results of the whole preceding period of development, and at the same time opened a new stage in the progress of the cooperation between the Allied countries in war and in the post-war period.

This new phase has been characterized by the fact that now it is no longer a question of the exchange of information and consultations on different questions, but one of joint decisions on the cardinal questions of war and peace.

It is a question of striking Germany a concerted and final blow and of securing a durable peace after victory.

As the foreign press rightly points out, the Teheran Conference was the biggest diplomatic event of the war. Unquestionably, the conference will tremendously influence the course of the war and the post-war organization of the world.

It demonstrated the growing stability of the three-power alliance, which undoubtedly will be further cemented in the course of coming events.

The very fact of a meeting of the leaders of the three Allied powers is significant. This meeting has cut short the speculations of the enemies who spoke of the "impossibility" of a lasting agreement between the Soviet Union, the United States and Great Britain.

* From an editorial in No. 14 of the Soviet journal *War and the Working Class*.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As is known, there have been a number of meetings between the leaders of Great Britain and the United States during the war. The last such meeting was held in Quebec, during August of this year. But the main question, demanding the united efforts of all three powers, was the question of shortening the war, and could not be fully settled at conferences which took place without the Soviet Union.

The Teheran Conference adopted the necessary decisions on this important question. The whole world was greatly impressed by the three-power declaration which was signed by Roosevelt, Stalin and Churchill.

Its contents are more emphatic than any other document of the anti-Hitlerite coalition. The concise language of the declaration is in full keeping with its historical significance. It is not the language of common wishes, it is the language of action. The time for words has passed and it is now the time for deeds.

The confidence and determination which were expressed in every word of the declaration warm the hearts of friends with joy and strike fear into the hearts of the enemies.

The sincere and stirring words go to show that the mutual understanding and unity which were achieved at the conference are necessary for the decisive offensive against the enemy and for securing a durable peace.

The aim of the Allies in the sphere of the conduct of the war is clear: A complete victory over Hitlerite Germany in the shortest space of time is the paramount aim confronting the Allies. The leaders of the three powers, with the participation of representatives of the army staffs, have agreed upon the plans for destroying the German armed forces.

Thus, the last nail was driven into the coffin of Hitler's hopes of causing disagreement between the Allies in the conduct of the war. Thus the path was opened to surmounting the greatest difficulties in any coalition war, namely, that of ensuring joint blows at the common enemy.

It is now clear that the enormous, hitherto unparalleled manpower and material resources of the three Allied countries will be used as one fighting machine to crush the enemy. To guarantee this, a full agreement was reached at the Teheran Conference regarding the scope and time of the operations which will be launched from the east, west and south.

Without in the least underrating the enemy's strength, and soberly weighing his military resources, the leaders of the three great powers, together with the representatives of the army staffs, jointly elaborated plans for the operations which will secure a rapid and complete victory over the enemy.

Mutual understanding was reached by the three leaders in the military sphere which will guarantee this victory. The outstanding military significance of the Teheran Conference is that it has drawn up a complete plan for the destruction of Hitlerite Germany.

The Red Army victories and the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

successful operations of the Allied troops have fundamentally changed the course of the war.

Hitlerite Germany is passing through a profound crisis and is on the brink of disaster. The task is now to finish off the fascist beast by speeding up the tempo. This task will be accomplished in a ruthless and increasing offensive of the Allies as proclaimed by the Teheran Conference.

The false illusion that has been built up by the Hitlerite demagogy that the Allied blows have allegedly passed their highest peak has been shattered. It is now clear to all that Germany will have to face heavier blows than ever before.

The prolongation of the war promises Germany nothing but new losses and sacrifices, new defeats and ruins, heavier and sterner payment. The united strategy of the Allied powers spells the death sentence for Hitlerite Germany and her satellites; it is now a matter of executing this sentence.

The Hitlerites are trying to cover up their extreme confusion in connection with the historic Teheran meeting with spiteful hissing and ridiculous inventions. Several days prior to the publication of the Teheran decision, the Hitlerites gave assurance that the conference would allegedly send out a call to the German people promising them favorable conditions in the event of a break with Hitlerism, and that the prime task of the conference was to undermine the "morale" of the German people.

Now the whole world sees that it is not a question of promises but of ruthless struggle, with the object of destroying the German war machine. As a result, the "morale" of the Germans will undergo a fundamental change.

The task is not only to ensure the destruction of Germany in the present war, but to strip her of the possibility of repeating aggression in the future.

The Allies clearly realize the need, once and for all, of cauterizing the ulcer of German aggression in order to secure a durable peace for the nations. Let the Hitlerite simpletons try to hide their fear by asserting that the Teheran Conference was aimed at having a psychological effect and that it belongs to the sphere of "war of nerves."

They will be answered very soon and in the only language that they understand—in the language of fire and steel.

* * *

At the Teheran Conference, of outstanding significance were the decisions in reference to securing a lasting peace. The declaration of the three Allied powers expressed the confidence that the concord existing between them will secure a durable peace.

The bitter experience of the past decade teaches us that the preservation of peace and security must rest on a tangible force that is capable of ensuring peace and of preventing its violation. Hence, the supreme responsibility of the Anglo-Soviet-American alliance and of all the United Nations.

This responsibility was fully rec-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ognized by the leaders of the three powers that are heading the anti-Hitlerite bloc and who have expressed their readiness to work jointly both during the war and post-war period.

The Teheran Conference dispersed a number of deep-rooted prejudices, resulting from former suspicious attitudes of certain circles in the Anglo-Saxon countries toward the Soviet Union. The prejudice that insurmountable barriers stand in the way of the cooperation of other powers with the Soviet Union, not only in war but also in the maintenance of durable peace, has been broken down.

The declaration of the three powers speaks of a world in which all the nations will live in freedom, where there shall be no tyranny and which shall be in keeping with their different strivings and conscience.

The experience of the war has shown that the difference in ideology and social order does not preclude the development and the strengthening of the fighting alliance and friendly cooperation between the Soviet Union, Britain and the United States.

This alliance has withstood very serious tests and in the forthcoming events will grow stronger.

Life has refuted the inventions of our enemies and their accomplices that the Anglo-Soviet-American alliance aspires to a "dictatorship of the great powers."

The three-power declaration solemnly announced the striving for collaboration and active participation of all countries, large and small, whose people have dedicated themselves in heart and mind, like the peoples of the Allied powers, to the task of eliminating tyranny, slavery, oppression, and intolerance.

Not a world domination of the great powers, but a world family of democratic countries—such is our aim. The leading role of the great peace-loving powers — the Soviet Union, Britain, the United States and China—in international politics is not directed toward restricting the rights and liberties of other peace-loving nations.

On the contrary, it is the best guarantee for their security and independent development in accordance with their national interests.

* * *

The three-power declaration, which is the death sentence for the bloody aggressors, at the same time guarantees freedom for all peace-loving nations. The three-power declaration must serve as the last warning to the Hitler satellite countries. Germany and her vassal countries must realize before it is too late that the hypocritical policy which they have been lately pursuing will not save them. Either destruction together with Hitler, or a break with him—this is the question which is facing all of Germany's vassals.

There is no third way out. If Hitler's allies, particularly the rulers of Finland and Hungary, unwillingly recognizing the inevitability of the destruction of Germany, are still trying to stir pity from the freedom-loving peoples and are even calling to their assistance the Atlantic

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Charter, one cannot help remembering that the "devil himself can quote scriptures to his own purpose."

The weighty words of the Teheran declaration are undoubtedly food for thought for certain neutral countries, who still are among the friends of the Axis powers.

The Allied policy toward smaller countries is most concretely and vividly expressed in the declaration of the three powers on Iran. This declaration recognized the assistance given by Iran to the Allies in the war against the common enemy.

The Allied governments declared their readiness to continue to give Iran economic assistance in the post-war period. Particular mention should be made of the statement of the three-power declaration on Iran to preserve the complete independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iran.

In the light of this clear statement, of what value are the different inventions of our enemies that the Soviet Union, Britain and the United States allegedly claim different parts of Iranian territory, different "suspicions" that have been spread by Hitler's friends about the Soviet Union's alleged "territorial claims" to the approaches to the Gulf of Persia, the Adriatic Sea and even to the approaches to the Atlantic?

By these inventions the enemies are trying to hide the universally known fact that the Soviet Union, which demands absolute respect for her territorial integrity, and inviolability for her borders as guaranteed by the U.S.S.R. constitution for her part, has set the example for absolute respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of other countries, large and small.

Like the peoples of the United States and of Great Britain, the Soviet people received with deep satisfaction the historic decisions of the Teheran Conference, which were signed by their great leader.

These decisions embody the iron will of the peoples of the three great powers who will move together in war and in peace. Nothing can break this will—neither the resistance of the enemy who is sensing his doom, and will undoubtedly have recourse to the most desperate steps, nor the intrigues of a small number, nor the vociferous accomplices of our common enemy who will continue to make themselves heard in the Anglo-Saxon countries. These people are blinded by their hatred for democracy and social progress and are still trying to save Germany from utter defeat.

The determination of the Allies is, once and for all, to eliminate the danger of German aggression and to refuse to support the anti-Soviet plans to establish a "cordon sanitaire."

But it is not these elements who represent the national interests of Britain and the United States. On the contrary, their activities run counter to the interests of their nations. It is not these elements who determine the policy of our Anglo-American Allies.

And if some of these people hypocritically express "regret" at the "insufficiently outspoken tone" of the Teheran decisions, it will hardly deceive anybody.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Soviet people, who have inscribed the most vivid pages of its history in the great liberation war against Hitlerite oppression and tyranny, are replying to the decisions of the Teheran Conference by straining their forces still more. They are confidently marching toward the day when the full force of the Allied armies will crash down on the enemy, and the fascist beast will be destroyed by the concerted operations of the three great powers.

This will open the way to the organization of the world on the principles of liberty and security and of securing peaceful and creative labor for all nations.

The lofty tasks which already confront the Allies will be the more successfully and fruitfully solved by the closer unity of the three Allied powers on the basis of absolute respect and their mutual vital interests.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REPORT TO THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE U.S.S.R.

(On the transformation of the People's Commissariat of Defense and the People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs from Union People's Commissariats into Union-Republican People's Commissariats. Report of the People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., on February 1, 1944.)

BY VYACHESLAV M. MOLOTOV

COMRADES, DEPUTIES: The question of the transformation of two People's Commissariats—the People's Commissariat of Defense and the People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs—from Union into Union-Republican People's Commissariats has been posed before the Supreme Soviet.

The Council of People's Commissars believes that this question is quite ripe. This is not a matter of the ordinary reorganization of two People's Commissariats. This is primarily a matter of placing new and most responsible tasks before the Union Republics. The question has been posed of new tasks and rights of Union Republics, firstly in the matter of the defense of our country, and secondly in the sphere of external relations with foreign states, and in this connection, of important transformations in our Union State.

Heretofore the Union Republics took part in the common work of creation of the organization and equipment of the Red Army. Our Army was created as an All-Union Army, and there existed no separate army formations of the Republics. Now it is proposed to institute army formations of Republics, which should form component parts of the Red Army. In this connection there arises the need for the creation of People's Commissariats of Defense in the Union Republics, as well as the necessity of the transformation of the Union People's Commissariat of Defense into a Union-Republican People's Commissariat.

After the foundation of the Union of Soviet Republics in 1922, foreign political relations were wholly concentrated in the Union People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs, to which individual Republics delegated their powers in foreign relations. Now the government of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Union proposes that Union Republics be granted powers to enter into direct relations with foreign states and conclude agreements with them. Naturally, the granting of powers to the Republics in the sphere of foreign relations renders it necessary to create People's Commissariats of Foreign Affairs in the Union Republics and to transform the Union People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs into a Union-Republican People's Commissariat.

The meaning of the proposed transformation is perfectly clear. This transformation signifies the great expansion of activities of the Union Republics which has become possible as a result of their political, economic and cultural growth, or, in other words, as a result of their national development. One cannot fail to see in this a new, important step in the practical solution of the national problem in the multi-national Soviet State, one cannot fail to see in this a new victory for our Lenin-Stalin national policy.

This transformation, however, has become possible not merely as a result of the strengthening of our Republics. It has become possible as a result of the achieved strengthening of our Union State as a whole. The strengthening of the Soviet Union that has taken place is most convincingly proved by the manner in which our Red Army, which bears the whole brunt of the struggle with the main forces of the most dangerous enemy, is beating the German fascist army and successfully brings nearer the time of the complete expulsion of the enemy from Soviet territory and his utter defeat.

Now it is more than obvious how scandalously the enemy's calculations on the Red Army's defeat fell through and how nearsighted were the Hitlerites' calculations on causing disunity among the peoples of the Soviet Union. Our army, which was joined by millions of people from all the nations in the Soviet Union and which receives such invaluable help from our guerrillas in the enemy's rear, proves more and more successfully with every day how strong our country has become, how powerful the Soviet system is, how great the friendship of the Soviet peoples is.

The present proposal on the transformations in the organization of defense and in foreign relations, providing for a great expansion of the functions of the Union Republics, should serve as a new confirmation of our confidence in the strength and growth of the forces of the Soviet Union. This confidence is demonstrated all the more forcefully that we propose to effect these transformations at the height of a patriotic war, when the forces of our peoples are strained so greatly and when not every state would venture to undertake such important transformations.

I. Transformation of the People's Commissariat of Defense

I proceed to the question of the transformation of the People's Commissariat of Defense. It is proposed by the draft of the law to establish that the Union Republics organize army formations of the Republics, and that the People's Commissariat of Defense is transformed from a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Union into a Union-Republican People's Commissariat. It is proposed accordingly to make the necessary addenda to the All-Union Constitution.

Now, too, we have national army formations in the Red Army. Our army has Lithuanian, Latvian, Estonian, Georgian, Azerbaijanian, Armenian, Kazakh and certain other army formations. Some of these army units were created during the patriotic war. Now that all the peoples of the Soviet Union strive to take their place in the ranks of the Red Army, creation of army formations of the Republics is of great importance to us. As is well known, in tsarist Russia certain nationalities and peoples were not conscripted for military service. For instance, the Uzbeks, Kazakhs, Tajiks, Turkmenians, Kirghizians, and most of the peoples of the Northern Caucasus, also peoples of the North, were not subject to conscription. Tsarism, naturally, did not trust peoples which it kept in a colonial or semi-colonial status. The tsarist power did not even do anything to prepare these peoples for gradual induction into the army.

In the Soviet time, the situation has changed radically. The legislation naturally contains no legal restrictions for some or other nationalities as regards conscription. But a certain time had to pass in order to render possible actual realization of conscriptions to the Red Army in all parts of the Soviet Union. Partial conscriptions to the Red Army were carried out in past years even in those districts of the U.S.S.R. where no conscriptions took place in old times. National army units were formed in the Red Army as well, but up to recent time these formations could not really develop. Now the situation has changed for the better. Adequate possibilities have been created for army formations in the Union Republics. All the Republics have not only cadres of rank and file fighters, but also certain cadres of commanding personnel capable of directing respective army units. Thus at present the creation of army formations in the Union Republics can be placed on a firm foundation.

But to realize this task it is necessary to have Republican People's Commissariats of Defense, and consequently there arises the necessity of the transformation of the Union People's Commissariat of Defense into a Union-Republican People's Commissariat. It is to be expected that this will also increase the attention paid by the Republics to the organization of military training in schools and institutions of higher education, of which we stand in need. Under such conditions, the creation of army formations in the Republics as component parts of the Red Army will play a not insignificant, positive part.

How will this affect our Red Army? Will this contribute to its strengthening, to the growth of its might? Yes, this is beyond any doubt. Our army has always been close to and cherished by the peoples of the Soviet Union. In the course of the patriotic war, still stronger became the love of the peoples of the U.S.S.R. for their army, still stronger and more universal became the pride of the Soviet people in the successes and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

heroism of the Red Army. Indeed, who fails to see what a glorious struggle is waged by our army for the liberation of the Ukraine, for the liberation of Byelorussia? Who fails to appreciate wholeheartedly what the Red Army does to prepare the imminent liberation of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Moldavia and the Karelo-Finnish Republic? Who fails to remember that Soviet troops saved Azerbaijan, Georgia and Armenia from the invasion of German fascism? Who of our Soviet people does not glorify our army for having defended our capital—Moscow, for having routed the Germans at Stalingrad and launched an offensive along the whole front, for having defended Leningrad and fully lifted the blockade from it, and for now chasing the enemy hordes from the native soil without giving him any respite? Who, save those plagued by fascism, fails to understand now that the Red Army fulfils a mission of liberation not only with regard to its own motherland, but also with regard to all democratic countries which fight for their honor, freedom and independence against the mortal danger presented by fascism?

Who further does not know that the men and women workers of our mills and factories, that the men and women peasants on the collective farms, that our intelligentsia, that all the Soviet people, are ready to give all their strength to enhance the might of the Red Army, that by their self-sacrificing labor they discharge by actual deeds their duty to the motherland, to the heroic Red Army?

The formation of army units of the Republics should serve to strengthen further our army as the defender of our country, as the reliable bulwark of the Soviet Union. The enemies of the Soviet Union need not doubt that as a result of these new army formations the forces of our state will grow still stronger. This will make them more cautious in the future.

This new embodiment of the growing friendship of the peoples of the Soviet Union will contribute to the further growth of the prestige of our country with the nations of the East and West.

II. Transformation of People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs

Of no lesser significance is the transformation of the All-Union Commissariat of Foreign Affairs into a Union-Republican People's Commissariat. Before the foundation of the Soviet Union, along with the People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic there existed People's Commissariats of Foreign Affairs in the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan, which on certain occasions maintained foreign relations with other states. During the early period when our state was not yet gathered into one Union state, but consisted of separate parts, a number of treaties and agreements were concluded between individual Soviet Republics and foreign states. On some occasions representatives of the Russian S.F.S.R. were specially authorized by other Soviet Republics to participate in interna-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tional conferences and to conclude treaties with other states on behalf of all or several Soviet Republics.

Comrade Stalin said at the first All-Union Congress of Soviets that "at that time the Soviet Republics, although they acted together, marched separately, occupied primarily by the problem of their existence." That was inevitable at the initial stage. When the U.S.S.R. was founded in accordance with the common will of the Union Republics, it was decided to unify relations with foreign states in one center. Then was created the All-Union People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs, in which were vested the powers of the People's Commissariats of Foreign Affairs of the separate Soviet Republics. Since then, up to our days, the Soviet state was represented abroad through All-Union diplomatic representatives. Treaties and agreements with foreign states were also concluded only on behalf of the Union. This was necessary at a certain stage of the development of our state and yielded its positive results by having strengthened the state and highly enhanced its part in international affairs. But even then, as far back as at the Party Congress in 1923, Comrade Stalin said: "We shall still take up the national question more than once, since national and international conditions are subject to changes and may still change. I do not preclude the possibility that subsequently we may have to separate certain commissariats which we are now merging in the Union of Republics. . . ."

Being the best authority on the national question, not only in our party and not only in our country, Comrade Stalin, who together with the great Lenin laid the foundation of the Soviet Union, pointed out even then that changes in the international situation and the national development would more than once call forth organizational changes in the machine of the Soviet state. No other state of affairs can be imagined, especially in such a young and rapidly gaining organism as the Soviet Union.

Now the question of the foreign relations of the Union Republics stands differently from the way it stood two decades ago when the Soviet Union was being founded. It grew out of the vital needs of the Republics and its solution is dictated by the interests of the Union as a whole. The time is long past when certain foreign states tried not to notice the existence of the Soviet Republic born in the October Revolution. Now, on the contrary, among foreign states there is a growing desire to establish and develop diplomatic relations with our state.

Certainly under conditions of world war this meets with peculiar, not insignificant difficulties, but still even in the years of war the international connections of the U.S.S.R. have been steadily extending. One may even say that it was just in the years of the war that the international connections of the Soviet Union have risen to a new and higher level. The facts are universally known. For the first time during the existence of Soviet power, we have established not

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

only friendly but even allied relations with Great Britain. Similar good relations have been formed between us and the United States of America. A powerful anti-Hitler coalition has been formed, headed by the Soviet Union, Great Britain and the United States of America, a coalition whose military and political importance for the whole range of democratic states can hardly be overestimated. The recently concluded Soviet-Czechoslovak Treaty may serve as an example of the strengthening of friendly relations of the Soviet Union with European states. The foundations have been laid for the cooperation of large and small democratic countries, not only in time of war against a common enemy, but also in the post-war period for the sake of safeguarding peace against new encroachments on the part of aggressive powers.

As is well known, the Moscow and Teheran Conferences played a most eminent part in the development and strengthening of the anti-Hitler coalition. Now as never before, great is the confidence of the peoples of the anti-Hitler camp in near and complete victory, in joint crushing blows of the Allies at the common enemy, which are already not distant, as well as confidence that the alliance and friendship of the anti-fascist countries will be steeled in this common struggle.

And still it cannot be said that this general positive course of development of the international connections of the Soviet Union could fully cover not only the requirements of the whole Union but also the multifarious and growing requirements of the Union Republics in foreign affairs. Thus the Union Republics have quite a few specific economic and cultural requirements which cannot be covered in full measure by All-Union representation abroad and also by treaties and agreements of the Union with other states. These national requirements of the Republics can be met better by means of direct relations of the Republics with the corresponding states. Naturally, questions of this kind require special concrete elaboration in Union and Republican organs. It cannot be denied either that a certain time will be required to organize these external activities of the Republics. Such questions are not solved after a cut and dried pattern. It is indisputable, however, that the problem of emerging into the arena of external activities has already acquired vital importance for a number of Republics.

Lastly, it should be acknowledged that this is in the interests not only of this or that individual Union Republic, but also in the interests of the entire cause of the expansion of international connections and the strengthening of the cooperation of the U.S.S.R. with other states, which is of such importance in time of war and which will yield fruit also in the post-war period.

Such are the grounds on which the necessity of the transformation of the People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs from a Union into a Union-Republican People's Commissariat should be recognized. Whereas in the initial period there existed only Republican People's Commissariats of Foreign Affairs, and in the second period only a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Union Commissariat of Foreign Affairs, now the People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs should be transformed into a more complex and ramified organization—into a Union-Republican People's Commissariat.

It remains for me to add a few words on our diplomatic practice. It is necessary to note that the absence of special provisions in the Soviet Constitution as regards the rights of Union Republics to exchange of representations with other states and to the maintenance of foreign relations, is sometimes interpreted to the direct detriment of the interests of the Soviet Republics and of the Soviet Union as a whole. The proposed addition will serve to eliminate facts of this kind.

III. New Forward Stride in Solution of National Problem

The proposed transformation of the People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs and the People's Commissariat of Defense is a new forward stride in the solution of the national problem in the Soviet Union. This transformation is in direct accord with the principles of our Lenin-Stalin national policy. The realization of measures of this kind at the present time means that the Soviet state has reached a new level in its development, turning into a more complex and virile organism. In this one cannot fail to see fresh evidence of the great significance of the social principles of the organization of the Soviet Union.

In his report to the Congress of Soviets which adopted the Constitution of the U.S.S.R. in 1936, Comrade Stalin thus characterized the victory of the national policy of the Soviet power which insured the success of the formation of a multinational state on the basis of socialism:

"The absence of exploiting classes which are the principal organizers of strife between nations; the absence of exploitation which cultivates mutual distrust and kindles nationalist passions; the fact that power is in the hands of the working class which is the foe of all enslavement and the true vehicle of the ideas of internationalism; the actual practice of mutual aid among the peoples in all spheres of economic and social life; and finally, the flourishing national culture of the peoples of the U.S.S.R., a culture which is national in form and socialist in content—all these and similar factors have brought about a radical change in the aspect of the peoples of the U.S.S.R.; their feeling of mutual distrust has disappeared, a feeling of mutual friendship has developed among them, and thus real fraternal cooperation among the peoples has been established within the system of a single Union state. As a result, we now have a fully-formed multi-national socialist state which has stood all tests and whose stability might well be envied by any national state in any part of the world."

Seven years—and what years!—have passed since then. Soon it will be three years that we have been waging the great patriotic war against German fascism and its allies, which use the material and manpower resources of nearly the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whole of Europe in their struggle against the Soviet Union. This has been a new—and the most serious at that—test for our multi-national state. But the Soviet Union has passed this test, too, with flying colors.

On the twenty-sixth anniversary of the October Revolution, Comrade Stalin thus summed up the latest period:

"All the peoples of the Soviet Union have risen as one to defend their motherland, rightly considering the present patriotic war the common cause of all working people, irrespective of nationality or religion. By now the Hitlerite politicians have themselves seen how hopelessly stupid were their hopes of discord and strife among the peoples of the Soviet Union. The friendship of the peoples of our country has withstood all hardships and trials of war and has become tempered still further in the common struggle of all Soviet people against the fascist invaders."

This—in Comrade Stalin's words—is one of the decisive sources of the strength of the Soviet Union.

Let us sum up. Carrying out under the present conditions important state transformation, we must of course pose the question of how this will affect the Red Army and its deep rear in the country. In other words, are we making a step toward the strengthening or toward the weakening of the U.S.S.R.?

Everything said above permits giving a definite answer to this question. The transformation of the People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs and the People's Commissariat of Defense which follows from the expansion of the tasks and functions of the Union Republics within the country and beyond its confines, far from running counter to the interests of the strengthening of our Union, on the contrary is being effected in the name of and for the purpose of the further strengthening of our great state.

Since the time when the Soviet Union was founded, the Constitution has insured to the Union Republics such a supreme expression of their sovereign rights as the right of free secession from the U.S.S.R. But as time passes the stronger becomes the desire of the peoples of the Soviet Union to live in close friendship among themselves, to help one another and to march together through all trials under the guidance of Soviet power.

The recognition by the Union of the increased requirements of the Republics in their state activities, including foreign activities, and legislative provision for these needs of the Republics, only serve to strengthen the fraternal relations among the peoples of our country and reveal still more fully the historic meaning of the existence of the Soviet Union to the peoples of the East and West.

It should be recognized further that the new forward stride in the solution of the national problem in the U.S.S.R. is of great importance from the viewpoint of all progressive humanity. At a time when German fascism—this worst product of imperialism!—has reared its head and unleashed a world war to strangle its neighbors, to destroy free states and impose its bandit impe-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rialist policy upon other peoples of Europe, and after that upon the peoples of the whole world—the new success in the realization of the Lenin-Stalin national policy in the Soviet state will have especially great international significance. This step of the Soviet power will constitute a new moral-political blow at fascism and its man-hating policy, hostile to its core to the interests of the free national development of peoples.

The Soviet Union and its Allies are already successfully beating fascism, which imposed this war, hastening the time of its utter military defeat. But we know that matters should not be restricted to the military defeat of the fascist forces. It is necessary to bring to completion the moral-political defeat of fascism as well. To this, we are certain, will successfully contribute those state transformations in the Soviet Union which are now submitted for your approval.

I express assurance that the Supreme Soviet will demonstrate the unanimity of the Soviet people in the solution of the question of the proposed state tranformations.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ON THE STUDY OF BROWDER'S REPORT*

BY DAVID GOLDWAY

EVER since the meeting of the National Committee on January 7-9 there has been in and around the party a surge of ideological activity unprecedented in our history. This flood of thought—fundamental, theoretical thought—is as unprecedented as the new world situation which called it forth, proving that today the American people are outgrowing the "Yankee . . . theoretical backwardness and their Anglo-Saxon contempt for all theory," regarding which Engels chided us fifty years ago.

For the most part, the discussions reveal a healthy situation. While there are certain questions still unanswered, the main line of Browder's report is being grasped—and is being accepted and endorsed. Because of lack of full understanding, however, there are some who express hesitations over specific aspects of our policy. A few even think we are being forced to step backward, to accept a bitter pill. They are worried, in the main, by the notion that we are postponing or abandoning socialism. They want to be convinced that we are not falling victim to revisionism or vulgarization. The questions being asked deal in extraordinarily large measure with fundamentals, such as the nature of capitalism, imperialism, the class struggle, etc. This healthy concern for basic principles is a wholesome phenomenon, to be encouraged. Our only concern should be to have the answers, to grasp, explain and apply the political line and orientation of our National Committee as embodied in the historic report of Comrade Browder.

Today, the ideological front is in many respects the No. 1 front. The whole breathtaking perspective opening before us depends, in the very first place, on clarity, on understanding — Marxist theoretical understanding.

This is true no less for the party than for the nation. Without basic understanding, the people will not be able to defeat those bent on destroying the perspective of peaceful cooperation for many generations to come. In the same way, no party task, no party drive can be successfully carried through unless the party is mobilized ideologically and politically behind the policies of the National Committee. Where, for example, shall we find the tremendous stores of energy necessary to carry through our membership drive if we

* Excerpts from a report to the New York State Committee of the Communist Party, on January 21, 1944.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

do not win ideological clarity in the ranks of the party?

The first task in our ideological campaign is to make the fullest use of Browder's report to the National Committee. In every club there must be guarantees that this pamphlet, *Teheran and America*,* reaches the hands of every single member. Clubs should also take the responsibility for mailing the pamphlet to trade union and community leaders, inviting their comments and asking them to discuss with us the questions Browder raises. While the main concentration should be on the Browder report to the National Committee meeting, the little pamphlet, *A Talk About the Communist Party*,** should be regarded as a supplement and should also get special attention.

But distribution is only part of the job. There must be a guarantee that the report is *read and studied.* Its content should permeate every aspect of our political work. It should constantly be referred to and quoted from. Its scope and depth are so great that it is hardly likely that a single event of political importance will take place in the next few months that will not be richly illuminated by Browder's analysis of the fundamental problems of Teheran and America. It will therefore be a simple matter to integrate practically every current question with the more basic ones raised in Browder's report, and to use this as a guide to action.

The gravitation of the party to y also opens up tremendous opportunities for increasing the circulation of the *Daily Worker, The Communist,* and other literature, particularly the Marxist classics. Basic books and pamphlets should and can be sold in greatly increased quantities in every club of the party, at rallies, forums, and open meetings, as well as in bookshops.

It is clear that if we are to develop the fullest clarity in our party, club discussions must be supplemented by a network of schools, classes and study groups transcending anything we have had before. There is a great hunger for such study. Our job is to take the organizational measures necessary to guarantee the maximum fulfillment of the thirst of our party and the people around us for theoretical understanding. This means that the question of classes must not be left in the hands of an auxiliary (and in some cases neglected) department in the party organization. Every leading committee should assume supervision over classes.

Reaching the absentees with the pre-convention discussions is a major problem. It has already been suggested that the Browder pamphlet be gotten to every member. In addition, club bulletins should feature the pre-convention discussions. Supplementary material should be made available to the absentees. Comrades and clubs should be encouraged to send their questions in to the *Daily Worker.*

The suggestions thus far have been directed chiefly toward the party. Our fundamental task today, however, is to bring the position and

* Earl Browder, *Teheran and America*, Workers Library Publishers, 1944.
** Earl Browder, *A Talk About the Communist Party*, Workers Library Publishers, 1943.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

policies of our party more fully and more widely into the labor movement and the entire camp of national unity—to make us the educational institution for the millions, to make us a still more effective political factor.

Our club discussions should be made public. This does not mean simply that our meetings should be open and that two or three sympathizers should be invited. Non-party people should not only be involved as listeners at our meetings, but should be encouraged to express their views on the questions under discussion. In some cases it may be possible to organize round-table discussions with non-party people as participants.

Perhaps the most important thing about our meetings during the pre-convention period is the spirit in which they are conducted. Unless the discussions are well prepared politically, and are democratic—thoroughly democratic—they will in large part destroy the meaning of the plenum and prevent us from realizing the political possibilities inherent in our coming convention. Every club, every member and every friend must feel that the questions we are discussing are serious questions, affecting the life and future of our people and country, and that the opinions they express and the conclusions they reach will be given due consideration by the delegates to the convention, democratically elected by the whole party.

Clubs should be encouraged to exercise the greatest initiative in thinking through and especially in applying the line of the plenum. We must remember that what was worked out by our National Committee was a political orientation and a guide to action. This orientation will take on meaning only as we give it life in the daily work of our party, and in the first place, of our party clubs and of our mass activity.

During the pre-convention period all forms of mass education must take a great spurt forward. Forums must become a major activity for every club. Symposia, debates, round table discussions, interpretation please programs—these must sweep through our party. Non-party people must be involved. Cultural and social activities should be combined with the educational features. Leaflets and community papers should appear more frequently. In many communities radio broadcasts can and should be arranged to discuss the party's position as outlined at the National Committee meeting. The local press, which is frequently easier to "break into" in smaller cities, should be gotten to discuss our position, both through the news columns and through letters to the editor. Boldness and ingenuity should be encouraged in developing new forms for our mass educational work.

Our mass education in this period must, of course, be directed toward the membership drive in which we are engaged. In this connection, it may be well to give a word of warning. We must be careful to remember that the approach of an outsider to the problems raised by the National Committee will not necessarily coincide with that of the party

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

member. While party members will be deeply concerned about many theoretical questions as related to the political line and orientation of our party, most prospective members will be interested chiefly in our program of action, our attitude toward the major political questions of the day.

* * *

The foregoing has dealt with problems of form and method in our ideological campaign. What follows is a few thoughts on content.

First, it might be of some interest to examine the question of national unity in the light of American history. Most of us are familiar with the crucial importance of national unity behind Lincoln in the Civil War.

The fact is, however, that *every* major crisis in our history has called for the tactic of national unity as the only way to save the nation. The Revolution could be fought only when the Second Continental Congress worked out a basis for adjusting the sectional and class interests of the people of the Thirteen Colonies. Throughout the war the greatest danger that menaced the embattled republic was the ever-present threat of disunity. The same principle applied in the Jacksonian struggles, as well as in the Civil War period.

Even more instructive is a study of the aftermath period of every crisis in our history. The great lesson here is that in each case the tactic of national unity that was necessary to weather the storm proved to be equally essential when the storm was presumably over.

This first was driven home when immediately after our nation was established, the fathers of our country learned that there was operative in infant America, as now in Teheran, "a motive for agreement for the post-war period equally as forceful as the motive for agreement on the joint war" (Browder). Jefferson found that he had to save the nation from the Hoovers, Hearsts and du Ponts, of his day—the near-sighted Federalists who in their headlong chase for capitalist gain were undermining, not only the nation, but the very national foundation of capitalism that gave them their profits—as well as from the threat of foreign aggression, which was by no means automatically removed by the signing of a peace treaty. Therefore, in the great democratic struggle which Jefferson led at the end of the eighteenth century, there was forged a national unity coalition uniting farmers, artisans, small shopkeepers, plantation owners and even a substantial section of the merchants.

Even after Jefferson's great victory in the elections of 1800 the danger was not yet over, nor was the necessity to keep the nation united any less imperative. Egged on by foreign powers who sought to divide the young republic in order to bring it back into their imperialist orbit, and motivated by greed and a blind hatred of democracy, a fifth column grew and flourished. It permeated substantial sections of the leadership of the Federalist Party and even seeped into the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ranks of Jefferson's own party, involving as arch-conspirators his own Vice-President and the commander-in-chief of the army.

Burr's conspiracy was scotched and its leader driven out of public life in disgrace. But more revealing even that the exposure of the Burr conspiracy is the way in which the Federalists rallied to the traitor's defense after his arrest and sought to transform the trial of Burr into a brazen political attack on the President. Jefferson himself was quick to see that:

". . . had he [Burr] had a little dawn of success, they would have joined him to introduce his object, their favorite monarchy, as they would any other enemy, foreign or domestic, who could rid them of this hateful republic. . . ."

Jefferson likewise saw that the failure to deal decisively with Burr (Supreme Court Justice John Marshall engineered his acquittal in one of the most cynical travesties on justice in the history of our courts) was a "proclamation of impunity to every traitorous combination which may be formed to destroy the Union," and preserved "a head for all such combinations as may be formed within, and a center for the intrigues and machinations which foreign governments may nourish to disturb us."

Jefferson's answer to the conspirators was to *"consolidate the nation,"* and see these people [the Federalist clique] disarmed either of the wish or the power to injure their country." He strove to root national unity in the democratic processes and economic well-being of the people, launching, in his second term in office, a vast program dedicated "to the purpose of the public education, roads, rivers, canals, and other such objects of public improvement. . . ."

In his day, as in ours, it was necessary to fight bogeys. While we have to drive the bogey of "Communism" out of the heads of some present-day Americans, Jefferson tried to "reconcile the great body of those who thought themselves our enemies, but were in truth only the enemies of certain . . . imaginary creatures which existed only in the land of the rawhead and bloody bones, being created to frighten the credulous."

It was the building of national unity during the administrations of Jefferson and Madison that made it possible for our country to weather the War of 1812. The conspiracy that had not been completely scotched in 1807 burst forth in the abortive secessionist movement of the Hartford Convention, but the rest of the nation rallied to the government and the war effort, leaving the miserable Hartford conspirators in impotent isolation while a united nation celebrated Jackson's great victory at New Orleans and the conclusion of the war.

It is possible to draw similar lessons from the post-Jacksonian era and from the period of reconstruction after the Civil War. Reconstruction was possible, for example, only so long as, and only to the degree that, the forces which had united behind the war to smash the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

slavocracy and save the Republic continued to function as a national unity coalition. When the big capitalists of the Republican Party deserted to make a new coalition with the defeated slavocracy, reaction set in.

* * *

The necessary word of warning about not using our theory in a dogmatic way has been given by Comrade Browder. There are, of course, quotations applicable to the present situation which we shall be able to find, but our approach to theory must not be to seek in a doctrinaire way phrases or sentences to buttress our thinking on present-day problems. The cold fact is that the bulk of existing classical Marxist literature seems *on the surface* to condemn, not to support, our present approach. The essential thing, therefore, is to study Marxism so deeply, so thoroughly, as to absorb its *spirit,* its *content,* and its *method.* Once we have done that, then we shall see that even when we seem to be doing today some of the very things against which Marx spoke eighty years ago or Lenin thirty years ago, we are really following the essential teachings of Marx and Lenin.

"We must know . . . how," Lenin wrote (when confronted in 1917 with one of the great unpredictable phenomena of history, namely, dual power), "to supplement and amend our old Bolshevik 'formulas,' for, as it proved, they were sound in general, but their concrete realization turned out to be different. *Nobody* hitherto thought, or could have thought, of dual power." *

"Our Communist policy," said Browder in the introduction to *The People's Front,* "represents a constant struggle to meet more adequately the problems of a rapidly changing world. Every step we make in this direction is a 'contradiction' of the position from which we stepped. Far from wishing to hide these 'contradictions,' we would push them forward for the more serious student as the highest lesson we have to teach—the cause of change, its technique, its timing—the why, the how, and when—in short, the process of history in the making and the role of political consciousness therein.

". . . for adult political minds, it is no argument for or against the . . . positions that these positions have been constantly changing. The only serious questions that can and must be asked are: What has been the direction of the change, has it helped to unite the workers and the poor people and democrats generally against their worst enemies, or has it helped our worst enemies to divide us even more and thereby threaten to defeat us?"

It is not sufficient to send our comrades to the classics with only the negative help of a warning not to be dogmatic. We have to give them some positive help by directing them to those places where they can best learn the method of applying Marxism to the present-day unprecedented situation.

In reading the classics, it will be found that among the most revealing works are those which dealt

* V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works,* Vol. VI, p. 27.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with moments in history when sharp changes and sudden turns were taking place.

"Our theory," Browder said, "guides us through crises, through moments of great change, because it is the science of social development, it is the generalization of all past history, and forecasts future history. All other theories fall into bankruptcy precisely in the moments of great change, because they take their foundation from that which itself is undergoing change, they are static, mechanical, idealistic, and do not see or understand the real moving forces of history. That is why any individual, group, party or class, which is guided by any theory except Marxism-Leninism, finds its theory breaking up and failing in the moment of crisis and change." *

For example, Volume VI of Lenin's *Selected Works* is particularly interesting because in the months from February to October, 1917, Russia was passing through an especially unprecedented period. To be sure, it was unprecedented in a totally different way from today. But then, as now, it was necessary to apply Marxism with a boldness and a creative courage comparable to what is required today.

Practically from the moment of the outbreak of the February revolution Lenin recognized that

". . . as a result of a unique historical situation, absolutely dissimilar movements, absolutely heterogeneous class interests, absolutely contrary political and social tendencies have *merged*, and merged in a strikingly 'harmonious' manner." *

The tactics which he proposed, consequently, were based, not on old concepts of class and political relations, but on the concrete conditions at the "given moment," even though those tactics had no precedent in history and were based on no rule-of-thumb precepts to be found in the "old books."

Among the unique conditions of the early months of 1917 was the phenomenon of "dual power," a situation in which, "side by side with the Provisional Government, the government of the *bourgeoisie*, there has developed *another* government . . . the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies." Without trying to draw any parallel between that period and the present (and indeed, warning against it), it is possible to imagine that situations may develop sometime in the future in some European countries in which similar unprecedented relations of class and political forces might exist. If such conditions arise, it will undoubtedly be necessary to work out tactics, based on the particular concrete situation, that have no precedent in history. A careful study of Lenin's *method*, therefore, during the period when he was dealing with "dual power," will be very helpful.

Speaking of the Provisional Government very shortly after he returned to Russia in April, 1917, Lenin said:

". . . It cannot be overthrown now, for it is being maintained by a direct

* Earl Browder, *Theory as a Guide to Action*, Workers Library Publishers, 1939, pp. 9-10.

* V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. VI, pp. 7-8.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and indirect, a formal and actual *agreement* with the Soviets of Workers' Deputies. . . . Generally speaking, it cannot be 'overthrown' by any ordinary method, for it rests on the '*support*' given to the bourgeoisie by the *second* government—the Soviet of Workers' Deputies. . . .

"In order to obtain the power of state the class conscious workers must win the majority to their side. *As long as* no violence is used against the masses, there is no other road to power." *

Later, while preparing the people for every eventuality, he still sought to find a basis for a *peaceful* solution of their problems. As late as September 14 (less than two months before the October Revolution), he proposed a compromise to the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks:

"We may propose a compromise," he said, ". . . only because a specific situation exists, which obviously will last only a very short time; and it seems to me we should do so. . . .

"At this moment, and only at this moment, perhaps *only for a few days*, or for a week or two, such a government might be set up in a perfectly peaceful way. It is extremely probable that it would guarantee the peaceful advance of the whole Russian revolution, and provide unusually good chances for greater strides toward peace and the victory of socialism on the part of the world movement.

"For the sake, and only for the sake, of such a peaceful development of the revolution—a possibility *extremely* rare in history and *extremely* valuable, a possibility that comes only in exceptionally rare cases—the Bolsheviks, partisans of world revolution and of revolutionary methods, may, and should, in my opinion, consent to such a compromise." *

Perhaps one of the most important lessons to be learned from the Russia of 1917 is the remarkable flexibility of the tactics of the Bolsheviks. At every moment the tactics were suited to the occasion, changing as the situation changed. From an acceptance of the fact that the time was not yet ripe for the overthrow of the Provisional Government, the party changed its slogan at its conference in April to "All Power to the Soviets!" which meant putting an end to dual power and transferring the whole power to the Soviets. Still later, after the July days, the slogan "All Power to the Soviets!" had to be temporarily withdrawn because the Soviets were at that time controlled by the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, who had definitely lined up on the side of counter-revolution. After the defeat of the Kornilov revolt there came another great upsurge of revolutionary sentiment, and when the Petrograd and Moscow Soviets endorsed the Bolshevik policy, the slogan "All Power to the Soviets!" was again on the order of the day.

While we have no reason to believe that such rapid change in fundamental alignments of forces will take place today, or in the near future—and certainly not in the United States—it is of greatest profit to learn the lesson that:

* *Ibid.*, p. 29.

* *Ibid.*, p. 209.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Marxism demands an extremely precise and objectively verifiable analysis of the interrelation of classes and of the concrete peculiarities of each historical moment. . . . A Marxist must take cognizance of actual events, of the precise facts of *reality,* and must not cling to a past theory, which, like all theories, at best only outlines the main and the general, and only *approximates* to an inclusive grasp of the complexities of living reality.

" 'Theory, my friend, is gray, but green is the eternal tree of life.' " *

Similar lessons can be drawn from the history of France in 1870-71, when sharp changes and sudden turns were also taking place. Marx's little book *The Civil War in France* makes very profitable reading indeed, as does the correspondence of Marx and Engels dealing with this period.

Still another epoch that warrants thorough study is the 1930's. That period produced the Seventh World Congress material, which should be re-read by every one of us, with special attention to Dimitroff's report. There we find not only the most fundamental analysis of the nature of fascism, but a tactical approach of the united working class and people's front of struggle against fascism, which has rich and great lessons for us today, a decade after it was worked out. The contributions of Stalin during this period, to be found in large part in the latter section of the new edition of *Leninism,* are also of great value. It was in 1938 that there appeared one of the greatest monuments of Marxist literature, *The History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.* This book, and particularly its brilliant essay on "Dialectical and Historical Materialism" (written by Stalin), should be on everyone's list for re-reading and study today.

No suggestions for reading today can omit reference to the works of Comrade Browder during that period, particularly *The People's Front.* There are also two speeches of Browder which for some strange reason never found their way into his books, that I should like to recommend: *The Democratic Front* (1938) and *Social and National Security* (1938). The last named has some interesting material on political parties. It must also be said that Browder's *Victory—And After* remains the book for the duration. Browder himself leaned heavily on the book in his report to the National Committee. How much more reason have we to return to it.

These things are mentioned in the hope that they will help give direction to our reading of theoretical material. The temptation to range over the vast, fertile landscape of Marxist literature is almost irresistible today. Yet "art is long and time is fleeting." We must get our theory quickly. There's a job to be done.

Let's do that job, comrades, taking our inspiration as well as our political lead from Comrade Browder and our National Committee.

* *Ibid.,* pp. 32-34.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE TO CONGRESS

BY MAX GORDON

THE historic importance of President Roosevelt's Message to Congress on the State of the Nation, on January 11, lies in the fact that the President reiterates and develops the meaning for America of the Teheran decisions. He advances the program for implementing these two basic propositions upon which Teheran and America's national interest rest:

1. "We have joined with like-minded people in order to defend ourselves in a world that has been gravely threatened with gangster rule";

2. All Allies are fully agreed that the future development of each depends upon the elimination of wars and even "the threats of wars." This requires that "all freedom-loving nations shall join together in a just and durable system of peace" in which military control over disturbers of the peace will be exercised. All Allies are also agreed that "an equally basic essential to peace is a decent standard of living for all individual men and women and children in all nations."

Freedom from fear of war, the President adds, is eternally linked with freedom from want.

Translating this in terms of America's future foreign and domestic policy, the President makes it clear that the nation's future course must be close economic and political collaboration with our Allies, the encouragement of rising living standards throughout the world, and economic security at home.

This, we submit, is a good and sufficient basis for national unity today and in the postwar period.

The President notes, of course, that there are enemies of that policy operating within the nation. He warns against those "who burrow through the nation like unseeing moles and attempt to spread the suspicion that if other nations are encouraged to raise their standards of living, our own American standard of living must of necessity be depressed."

He does not name those "moles." Some of them are, however, quite open in their hostility to the policy of world collaboration and make no secret of their aims, which are to set the nation back on the path of ruthless struggle for world imperialist domination.

Their most violent spokesmen are the Patterson - McCormick and Hearst press. The political figures who express this position most brazenly are the openly avowed Amer-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ica Firsters of the Wheeler-Nye-Reynolds-Fish-Gerald Smith variety.

But the chief source of strength of the "moles" can quickly be spotted simply by noting whom these avowed anti-Teheran elements are boosting for the Presidency. They make no secret of the fact that they base their main hopes for a reversal of F.D.R.'s program on the election of a reactionary Republican like Dewey, Bricker or Warren—men who are associated politically with the dominant, Hooverite, group in the leadership of the Republican Party.

It is this leadership which is the political center of those "moles," whose conception of our future policy is economic and political warfare and exploitation abroad and its inevitable consequence of bitter oppression at home. It has its political counterpart in the Farley-Woodring anti-F.D.R. "revolt" in the Democratic Party.

The realization of the program laid down by the President's message requires, then, that this leadership be decisively defeated in its current bid for power and its influence in national politics eliminated, or at least reduced to a minimum.

* * *

The President has long stressed the indivisibility of the military and domestic fronts in this total war, and does not fail to emphasize it in this message.

"When we speak of our total effort," he says, "we speak of the factory and the field and the mine, as well as the battleground—we speak of the soldier and the civilian, the citizen and his government."

Implementing, therefore, the first point in the Teheran Conference decisions—the mobilization of all Allied resources for the final blow against the Nazis—he advances his immediate five-point program for Congressional consideration:

1. A realistic tax law "which will tax all unreasonable profits, both individual and corporate, and reduce the ultimate cost of the war to our sons and daughters."

2. A continuation of the law for the renegotiation of war contracts (then threatened by Congress) "which will prevent exorbitant profits and assure fair prices to the government."

3. A cost of food law which will enable the government, through the use of subsidies, to place a reasonable floor under prices paid to the farmer and a price ceiling on food bought by the consumer.

4. Early extension of the Price and Wage Control Act of October, 1942, which expires on June 30. The President warns that if the Act is not extended well in advance of the expiration date we shall have price chaos this summer.

5. A national service law, which is recommended only if the other four points are accepted by Congress.

The first and third points of the legislative program are not new. They have been the subject of bitter Congressional struggle for the past year and are part of the President's anti-inflation policies.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Regarding the second point, the danger of elimination of the Renegotiations Law seems to have been temporarily averted by the Congressional compromise that it continue, substantially unchanged, until 1945.

In his budget message the President develops his argument on taxes and subsidies to show how both are essential elements in the mobilization of the nation's resources for the total war effort.

Regarding taxes, he recounts his previous recommendation for an additional $16,000,000,000 tax program, and the later Treasury proposals, scaling this down to $10,500,000,000. This program, he claims, is no more than a minimum, and he advances two major reasons why heavier taxation is necessary:

1. As a necessary support to wage and price policies.

2. As a means of alleviating the burden of postwar debt through recapture of excessive profits. He notes that "corporate profits after taxes are running at an all-time high," and insists that the "only effective way now to control the volume of debt and to minimize postwar adjustments is to adopt a truly stiff fiscal program."

Obviously, failure to recapture the huge war profits now means a greater burden of taxation on the people later to pay the cost of the war.

The President has thus far been blocked in all his efforts to tax war profits. Since April, 1942, when he first advanced his anti-inflation program of which a tax measure that would limit net incomes to $25,000 was point one, he has regularly and persistently appealed to Congress, in the name of national unity and of war and post-war economic stability, to tax excess incomes.

His appeals have been unheeded and the specific proposals of the Treasury Department completely ignored by the Congressional committees charged with drafting tax legislation and by the two houses of Congress. They have devoted themselves chiefly to protecting swollen war profits and to devising methods of placing the tax burden on the low-income groups.

The program recently passed by Congress over the President's veto after the spectacular Barkley "revolt" is a perfect illustration of the obstructionist policy pursued by Congress in regard to the President's taxation program for victory.

The $16,000,000,000 additional tax proposal was first advanced by the President in his 1943 budget message. In the form finally recommended by the Treasury Department, the $10,500,000,000 to be raised was to be gotten chiefly from higher income and corporation taxes, and bigger excise imposts chiefly on luxury items. The Victory Tax on low-income groups was to be removed, thus taking all direct tax burdens off the 9,000,000 families earning less than the minimum taxable income. In one respect the Treasury proposal did hit lower-income groups; it recommended reduction of exemptions.

Congress simply brushed aside the Treasury proposals and drafted its own program, which called for raising only $2,300,000,000, less than one-quarter asked for by the Treas-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ury and one-sixth of what the President had urged in his budget messages of 1943 and 1944. What is more, the Congressional measure retained the Victory Tax on the $12-a-week wage earner and gave a number of special privileges to corporations.

Instead of the $6,000,000,000 asked for in increased income taxes, hitting chiefly the upper brackets, Congress provided for $660,000,000. In place of the $1,100,000,000 in higher corporation taxes, the Congress bill called for $500,000,000. It eliminated entirely the Treasury recommendation for an additional $400,000,000 in higher estate and gift taxes.

Yet profits of corporations in 1943, after taxes were paid, amounted to over $8,000,000,000, just about double the net profits of the last peacetime year, 1939, and nearly double the highest profits made in any year of the last war, when 23,000 new millionaires were created.

But even this does not tell the entire story. Many corporations have jacked up the salaries of their officers to astronomical figures. For instance, a survey of the salary increases of 121 companies picked at random, made on the basis of reports filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission, showed that these companies had raised salaries of officers and directors $10,000,000 from 1940 to 1942. Some salaries had jumped as much as 3,700 per cent, and jumps of 50 and 100 per cent were commonplace.

The policies of Congress are designed to protect these swollen war incomes from taxation and thus to place the cost of the war on the masses now and in the post-war world.

Can there be any question in the face of these profits that the President was justified in terming the Congressional tax program "a tax relief bill providing relief not for the needy but for the greedy"? It is this that is the crux of the dispute between the President and the National Legislature, not any formal issue of executive versus legislative powers. The latter is purely a smokescreen thrown up to obscure the profiteering and war-obstructing content of the Congressional measure.

Clearly, Wendell Willkie's criticism that the Administration tax program is too soft, made after it was so seriously mauled by the Congressional majority, is sheer partisan poppycock.

Regarding the subsidy program, the President warns that the system of support prices to the farmers, essential to maximum, planned wartime food production, cannot be operated without it. The purpose of the support price system, he says, is no longer to increase farm prices generally, since they have already reached record levels. It is to adjust relationships between farm prices in harmony with war production needs.

The support price system, in other words, is designed to encourage production of those crops essential to our war economy.

To the farmer, of course, such a system of minimum prices at current levels is an immense boon. It is a boon, however, only to the extent that prices to the consumer

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are properly controlled. Once the lid on consumer prices is lifted and inflation results, his floor prices become meaningless and he, together with the worker, is left behind in the race between rising prices for what he buys and his income.

As in the tax program, the President has sustained setbacks at the hands of the Congressional obstructionists on the subsidy issue, though to date he has still managed to keep his program in operation. Defeat of that program would wreck the farm price support system, leaving the Administration with no effective way of controlling and pushing war food production; it would create chaos in the field of price control with incalculable consequences to national unity on the industrial and agricultural fronts.

In his Congress message, the President takes particular note of the effect on white collar workers and others in the fixed-income group who, he states, add up to a quarter of the entire population of the nation. In his budget message he points to the intimate connection between economy in government and his stabilization program. He tells Congress that if prices and wages go up —and the latter must if the former does—then his estimates of Federal expeditures must be drastically revised upward. That, of course, has not prevented those brave champions of government "economy" who rant against "New Deal extravagance" from voting to destroy stabilization by defeating the subsidy plan.

The fourth point in the legislative program presented by the President is new in the sense that the battle for extending the Price and Wage Control Law has not yet been undertaken. It is not new, however, in that the struggle for effective price and wage controls has been raging ever since the President advanced his anti-inflation program, back in the spring of 1942.

Successful sabotage of the program by foes of price control has resulted in a distortion of the whole stabilization program. While basic wage increases have been limited to the 15 per cent of the Little Steel Formula, prices have risen 43.5 per cent, according to the joint A. F. of L.-C.I.O. price survey.

This disparity has resulted in increased strains on national unity and some difficulties in production. It has also had the serious political effect of giving the defeatist elements a weapon with which to create confusion within the labor movement.

There can scarcely be any doubt, in view of the record of Congress, that the issue of extending the Stabilization Act will be seized upon by F.D.R.'s Congressional foes as an opportunity to cripple further the operation of price control, to clamp down on labor standards and to promote more confusion in our wartime economy.

As a matter of fact, some of them have already served notice that they intend to make it the occasion for continuing their war on subsidies.

As regards the national service proposal, discussion of which has unfortunately tended to obscure the other immensely important political and economic aspects of the mes-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sage, the President evidently had three things in view.

First, he looked upon such a measure as a means for greatly strengthening national unity and enhancing the nation's war morale.

"It will give our people at home that assurance that they are standing four-square behind our soldiers and sailors," the message says. "And it will give our enemies demoralizing assurance that we mean business. . . ."

Second, he considered it a method of easing the man-power problem by utilizing the millions not fully and most effectively involved in the war effort.

Third, it was proposed as a means of securing stronger unity between the armed forces and the civilian population.

While labor has no quarrel with the objectives of the President in advancing his proposal for national service, it does not trust the present Congress to pass one that would meet the President's specifications. It considers that any measure passed by Congress would be so rigged as to destroy labor's rights and would provide no safeguards to protect the economic standards of the workers. The current Austin-Wadsworth Bill is such a measure.

Moreover, national service must clearly be tied to profits limitation and strict price control, as the President recommended. Labor has little faith that Congress will accept this. Hence, it has opposed Congressional action on the issue.

A meeting of the national C.I.O. Executive Board, however, accepted the intent of the President's proposal, while rejecting Congressional action. It recommended that labor, government and employer representatives in tight man-power areas get together to work out methods of solving the manpower problem.

Besides working out alternative methods of solving that problem, labor has the job of preventing the issue from weakening the struggle for the basic features of the President's program for victory and the post-war world, and from causing division between labor and the President and between labor and the rest of the population.

Labor's position on the message as a whole is set forth in C.I.O. President Philip Murray's recent declaration urging a Labor-Industry-Government Conference to work out a program for manpower mobilization. In this message President Murray, in behalf of the C.I.O., stated:

"The President in his message touched upon the efforts of the leaders of the United Nations at the conferences of Moscow, Cairo and Teheran to obtain the unity of action essential for a speedy victory over the Axis forces and to establish a durable and lasting peace for the peoples of the world. The C.I.O. subscribes completely to the basic decisions which were made at these conferences. The goals set reflect the desires and aspirations of the peoples of the world."

Specifically, in regard to manpower, Murray declared:

"The C.I.O. is fully prepared and anxious in the interest of assuring

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the maximum utilization of manpower for the war effort, to meet with representatives of industry and the government in order that a program may be formulated on the basis proposed. In this manner we can accomplish the end sought by all who have as their primary interest the successful prosecution of the war through the fullest utilization of the effort of every American and of all available resources and facilities. And we shall thereby defeat any attempt to enact the type of legislation designed to smash labor unions which could only result in undermining a united people's forthright and uncompromising support of our nation's war effort."

One more immediate legislative issue is raised by the President in his message—the soldier vote, on the subject of which he later wrote a separate message.

As this is written, the issue is being fought out in conference between the two houses, and the outcome is in doubt. Whichever way it emerges from conference, however, the fight is not yet over. If an unsatisfactory measure is forced through, the President will veto it and the fight will be thrown back into the lap of Congress. If a bill satisfactory to the President emerges and he signs, the struggle will be transferred to the states where many G.O.P. and Southern tory administrations may well try to block the count of Federally collected ballots. Governor Dewey of New York, in his now-famous letter to Senator Styles Bridges on the subject, clearly implied that New York will not honor a ballot Federally-handled.

The battle against the right of the soldiers to vote is in the first place the work of the Republican Party national leadership, the Spanglers, Martins, and Tafts. Southern poll-tax Congressmen were split on the issue, with more than half of them in the House voting for the Worley Federal measure.

The reactionary Republican leaders were, and are, ready to risk the wrath of the nation in perpetrating this greatest vote steal in American history, directed against the 10,000,000 men and women in uniform. It is the first stage in their attempted political coup d'état against the American people, their bid for usurpation of power through a campaign of fraud, trickery and wild demagogy, made necessary because their real aims are so completely contrary to the will of the American people.

It is clear that this first step in their bid for power, the attempt to deprive close to one-fifth of the nation's electorate of the right to take part in the 1944 national elections, must be defeated nationally and in the states, and the indignation of the people aroused to greater heights against the perpetrators.

* * *

Implementing the second proposition laid down at Teheran—the building of a peaceful, secure post-war world—the President notes that the future existence of American democracy is tied up with the execution of the Teheran decisions. In his budget message he points out that American economy, in order to be secure, must depend upon foreign markets, and that these markets in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

turn depend upon a stable, peaceful postwar world. A secure economy, he maintains, is essential to the maintenance of our democracy.

"Military victory is not enough," says the budget message, "We shall not have completed the defense of our way of life until we also solve the second task, the reconstruction of our economy in which everyone willing to work can find for himself a place in productive employment. The enemy, though beaten on the battlefields, may still arise in our midst if we fail in the task of reconstruction."

But economic security for America does not depend solely upon world markets. It depends also upon fundamental economic readjustments at home. Hence the President, recognizing that "true individual freedom cannot exist without economic security and independence," advances the second bill of rights. The following rights are included:

The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries, or shops or farms or mines of the nation;

The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation;

The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living;

The right of every business man, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad;

The right of every family to a decent home;

The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health;

The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident and unemployment;

The right to a good education.

In advancing this bill of rights, the President notes the interconnection between the struggle for military victory and the post-war program of security.

"Our fighting men abroad—and their families at home—expect such a program and have the right to insist upon it," he tells Congress. He demands that Congress go to work now on the program and warns that if it does not produce, the "nation will be conscious of the fact."

One other important observation is made by the President concerning the second bill of rights. He notes that "unless there is security at home there cannot be lasting peace in the world."

To prove the point, he cites the warning delivered to the National Association of Manufacturers by War Production Board vice-chairman Charles E. Wilson concerning the danger of a "Rightist reaction" in the United States.

"All clear-thinking businessmen share that concern," F.D.R. says. The "Rightist reaction," he adds, will come from our failure to build a world that differs from the "so-called 'normalcy' of the 1920's." And that Rightist reaction, or "spirit of fascism" as the President calls it, will destroy world peace.

Thus, Teheran laid the foundation

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for a lasting world peace; but the realization of Teheran requires that America adopt such internal measures as will make for economic security at home—a prerequisite for an orderly and peaceful reconstruction of the postwar world.

The President is, of course, fully cognizant of the fact that both aspects of the Teheran decisions—full war mobilization and postwar security—have to be fought for in America. He is caustic about the "pests who swarm through the lobbies of the Congress and the cocktail bars of Washington representing . . . special groups . . . opposed to the basic interests of the nation as a whole."

He specifically mentions those who place profits above the national interest and those who want to gain partisan political advantage from the war.

There is no doubt that these profits-as-usual and politics-as-usual groups play a great part in the obstructionism of Congress. If Congress refuses to meet the President's tax program, it is largely because of the power of the profiteers and the desire of the Republicans to defeat the President on every possible measure for partisan reasons.

But the President also suggests a deeper conspiracy against the war program which, he says, is prolonging the war and costing American lives. He cites the foes of national unity in the American Revolution, the War of 1812 and the Civil War. History has judged the disruption caused in these wars as the work primarily of native fifth columnists who were opposed to the nation's victory, and the President has demonstrated in past utterances that he is well aware of this.

So in this war, those who are opposed to the fundamental objectives for which it is being fought—destruction of fascism and the advance of democracy and peaceful collaboration throughout the world—are the organizing center for all the dissident elements.

* * *

The key political struggle in the United States for the realization of the Teheran decisions is the campaign for the re-election of President Roosevelt.

This is not a partisan struggle, because the issue involved is not a party or class issue but one in which the great bulk of the American people back the position of the President.

Mr. Roosevelt is the logical candidate of the forces of national unity, and not only of any particular party, in the same way that Abraham Lincoln was the candidate of all loyal Union forces, Republicans and loyal Democrats alike, in the elections of 1864. In that tradition of national unity, Earl Browder, in his address at Symphony Hall, Boston, on February 13, stated:

"President Roosevelt is the only political figure in our country whose election next November would constitute a guarantee that the policy of Teheran would guide our country in the ensuing four years. But it is my opinion that if Americans wish Roosevelt to accept the nomination it will be necessary to assure him in advance that the people are rising

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

above all partisan considerations, that they are uniting behind his policies so strongly, that without any diversion of his major attention from the tasks of the war his re-election is practically assured. . . . Our country needs above all a stable policy in its foreign relations, it needs the feeling and atmosphere of stability, it needs to have the policy of Teheran, adopted by the whole country in its overwhelming majority regardless of partisan alignments —therefore it needs Roosevelt, not as a partisan, but as a national leader in the broadest sense."

Every section of America—industry, labor, farmers, the Negro people —is interested in achieving expanded production, economic security and peace after the war. The President says that this is not only realizable but essential for the future of American democracy. Moreover, he shows how all these desires of the people are interlinked, how the failure of one threatens the achievement of all. He demonstrates, too, how they are all dependent upon harmonious world relations with our Allies.

Compare this with the outlook of a candidate like Governor Dewey, for instance, as revealed in his message to the New York Legislature in January. Speaking of his plan to freeze the state's $148,000,000 surplus in a Post-War Reconstruction Fund, Dewey demands that "we husband these savings against the *inevitable* rainy day. . . ."

If the fact that the President represents a domestic program and an American foreign policy, in consonance with the Teheran perspective, that will enable American industry to expand, that will give to farmers the opportunity to produce in abundance, that will grant full employment to labor, can be gotten across to all sections of the American people, there will be no question of his re-election.

Let the contrasting perspectives of President Roosevelt and a Dewey sink in, and the demagogic arguments of the Republicans who try to separate foreign and domestic policy will receive their best answer.

There is, unquestionably, a very powerful public demand for the re-election of the President today. Numerous organizations of labor, of the Negro people, of national groups, and of cultural forces have also declared themselves for the re-election of the President. This trend is reflected in the action of the National Democratic Committee, which unanimously went on record in favoring Roosevelt's continuation in leadership. The immense popularity of the President has smashed the efforts of tories and of defeatists within the Democratic Party to build up an opposition to him.

Two of the most important state organizations of the Democratic Party, previously badly split, have united behind the fourth term—California and Pennsylvania.

The demand for Roosevelt's re-election will grow as the immense significance of the Teheran Conference decisions for the solution of America's postwar problems becomes more widely understood.

Earl Browder stated the supreme issue of the day:

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"For or against the Declaration of the Teheran Conference is the issue that separates the sheep from the goats, that determines all political alignments from now on until the policies there enunciated have been fully realized in war and peace. It is the all-dominating issue in the United States in the 1944 Presidential elections." *

* Earl Browder, *Teheran and America*, Workers Library Publishers, 1944, p. 15.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY, 1944

BY ELIZABETH GURLEY FLYNN

IT IS now thirty-six years since an annual holiday was chosen by American working women and mothers, of the East Side of New York, to hold demonstrations for suffrage. Four years later the 19th Amendment to our Constitution was passed and ratified, extending the right to vote to American women citizens. By that time the date March 8 had been adopted by the international Socialist movement to signalize the universal political demands of women. The names of Clara Zetkin and the martyred Rosa Luxemburg of Germany; of Krupskaya, the wife of Lenin; of Dolores Ibarruri (Pasionaria) of Spain; of our own Mother Bloor and other great women leaders are linked in our memories with this day, and its celebrations over the years.

International Women's Day is identified with a great historical event, the start of the Russian Revolution in 1917, when 90,000 workers downed tools and demonstrated in Petrograd (now Leningrad).

"Women predominated in the crowd. They abandoned the bread lines where they had been standing for hours and joined the strikers. . . . Later, when the Tsar's troops were massed against the workers they were found to be responsive to the appeals of the people. Workers, and especially working women, would form a close ring around the soldiers. They would seize the latter's bayonets with their hands and plead with the soldiers not to drown the revolution in the blood of their brothers, the workers." *(The History of the Civil War, U.S.S.R.)*

Later in Spain, on March 8, 1936, 80,000 women demonstrated at Madrid, led by Pasionaria, against the menace of fascism, and "for progress and liberty." Later that year, when the fascists started the war against the democratic Republic and the independence of Spain, the Spanish women fought side by side with their men under the courageous leadership of Pasionaria to defend their Republic against Hitler, Mussolini and their "stooge" Franco. The prisons of fascist Spain are today overcrowded with men and women who are being tortured, starved and murdered for their defense of their own country. The bloody Franco is still to be defeated. The struggle continues.

A moving description of women emerging from the most backward, medieval conditions into the light of a new world is given by Dr. Fannina Halle in her book *Women in the*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Soviet Far East, which is quoted extensively by the Dean of Canterbury. On International Women's Day, 1927, the women poured out into the public squares of Central Asian cities like Samarkand, Bokara, and Tashkent. Determined to break with the past, they gathered around the Lenin statues, tore off the veils which covered their faces and burned them. "The East was stirred to the depths of its being" at the "common abjuration of a thousand-year-old convention, now become unbearable," the author remarks. Even under new laws, it was not easy for women to free themselves. There were many martyrs, victims of prejudice and fear, in the early days.

Today there are no veiled women in the U.S.S.R. Today women are mayors of towns, managers of collective farms, Soviet deputies, aviators, carrying on the home front in these Asiatic Soviet republics, and throughout the U.S.S.R., while their men fight in the Red Army.

In *Battle Hymn of China* Agnes Smedley writes of March 8, 1939: "This was always celebrated throughout China as International Women's Day." In the South Yangtze Valley it was led by Mother Tsai, an old woman with sons in the army. She organized the Women's National Salvation Association. The women till the soil, make uniforms and shoes for the guerrilla fighters, care for the wounded. They ferret out merchants who deal with the enemy, and fight the evils of gambling and opium, fostered by the Japanese. A mass meeting was held in the great courtyard of an old ancestral temple. The front seats were reserved for women. Men leaders were invited to say only a few words of greetings. Posters called on the women to "revive the spirit of Florence Nightingale." In the morning the women carried gifts to the wounded. Mother Tsai always spoke of women's rights to the soldiers. The women organized classes in scouting and espionage. They are "the eyes and ears of the Army" to combat defeatism, uncover spies and traitors, boycott Japanese goods, etc. They question all strangers, and are alert to all dangers.

Behind the Japanese lines, in "guerrilla land," this devoted patriotic service to their country of millions of Chinese women continues today. The Chinese News Service reports of many women fighting in the army and of women in all auxiliary capacities. The "Dare to Die Corps" was a women's unit in Shanghai at the beginning of the war. Girl units of the Kwangsi Army fought in the battles to hold Hsuchow and Kunlunkwen. One brave girl, Miss Huang Chun-cher, doing publicity work, was trapped in a Japanese encircling movement. She took to the mountains and set up a radio station to report on enemy movements. The Japanese closed in on her, but before leaping from a precipice she killed many. Another Chinese guerrilla leader is a short, stout peasant woman named Wang, who helped decapitate six puppet officials and hanged their heads on the city gate. She collects information, sets huge fires, and is the heroine of a hundred battles.

Recently, Madam Sun Yet-sen

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

made a heart-rending appeal on behalf of these guerrilla warriors in *China Today,* that medical supplies and other materials sent from America be distributed to them and asked American labor to support her demand so "that the men who fight fascism behind Japanese lines get a share of its efforts commensurate with the task they are doing." There must be no blockade of these brave guerrillas by reactionary forces. "American labor has a stake in China's democracy," she urged. This noble and devoted woman, widow of the founder of the Chinese Republic, pleads for the armed miners, and railroad workers, farmers, villagers, women and little children who fight behind the lines.

Louis Adamic in his book *Native Land* tells of the participation of women peasants and professionals in the valiant struggle of Tito and his guerrillas to expel the fascist invaders from Yugoslavia. The book is dedicated to a boy and a girl, medical students who gave their lives for their country and who symbolize millions of such heroic youth who fight for their countries against the fascist hordes.

* * *

These are days of struggle. They are days of blood, tears, sacrifice and struggle on a world scale, to save civilization from fascism. Women have the greatest possible stake in victory. Every conceivable cruelty, indignity and exploitation has been forced upon women by fascism, especially by barbaric Hitlerism. We have time neither to celebrate nor to mourn on International Women's Day, 1944. We extend our fighting and heartfelt greetings to our heroic sisters of the Soviet Union, China, Great Britain, Yugoslavia and all the United Nations and our pledge to do our share, beyond what we American women have done so far. We can place no limits upon ourselves, nor say "This is enough!" when we think of our sister women in slavery throughout most of Europe today. We pledge to all men in the armed forces of our country and our allies that there will go to them on every battlefront a steadily increasing, uninterrupted supply of all they need for victory. We pledge to hold the home front against the defeatists, appeasers, fifth-columnist forces that would create disunity and confusion and who are boldly attempting to seize our government in the 1944 elections, to scuttle our win-the-war policies and program, to break up the American-Soviet-British coalition.

On International Women's Day let us renew our determination, as patriotic American women, to win this just war, *"to work together in war and in peace,"* in the words of the historic Teheran declaration. To none more than to the women of the war-torn world do the words *"enduring peace"* and the perspective of *"banish the scourge and terror of war for many generations"* strike a deeply responsive chord. To wives and mothers this has been the dream of the ages—"peace on earth."

But to our generation of women comes the opportunity actually to realize it in life by participating in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the implementing of the Teheran agreement into deeds. We are not called upon to fight on the battle field or as guerrillas. But we are called upon to furnish the sinews of war to our fighting men and to guard the home front, not only from possible attack from the enemy without but *from the enemy within.* This is the deeper meaning of the political struggle of 1944, which we have now entered. On the successful outcome of the national elections, on the uninterrupted continuance of the Roosevelt government policies sealed at Teheran, on the defeat of the Northern Tory and reactionary Republicans and their colleagues among the Southern Congressmen, depend the constructive cooperation and all-out support our Commander-in-Chief needs to carry out our nation's victory program—the program of Teheran.

We must begin the campaign to mobilize the women voters of the country now. Late summer or early fall will be too late. Registration dates vary throughout the country and unless the women citizens register they are politically nil. As the casualty lists come in, and the numbers will increase with the invasion of Europe to far beyond the present lengths, frantic attempts will be made by "Peace Now" and "America First" and similar pacifist and defeatist outfits to stampede the women voters against Roosevelt. Every issue which can be used to confuse or mislead the women voters by the Anti-Roosevelt forces will be forthcoming, as they attempt to do with the farmers, professionals and small businessmen. We see the same coalition of Tory Republicans and poll-tax Democrats who shoved through the Connally-Smith anti-labor bill are now sponsoring the so-called "Equal Rights" Amendment as a lure to women voters. The basic purpose of this bill is to nullify all protective legislation for women workers and for mothers. It is craftily concealed behind the liberal front of "equal rights." The women of the C.I.O. in Michigan have prepared for publication a list of the actual laws which would be declared unconstitutional in their state. This brings the matter right down to earth and I recommend like action for New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Illinois and other states where large numbers of women are employed.

A resolution opposing this Janus-faced Equal Rights Amendment was introduced in the New York City Council jointly sponsored by Benjamin J. Davis, Jr. and Mrs. Genevieve Earle. It memorializes the New York City Congressmen not to vote for it. Similar action should be repeated in other cities. The passage of this bill will not only do incalculable harm by outlawing all existing legislation for women but will make any further protective legislation impossible. The Republican Party now appears in the dubious role of "the friend of women," according to the National Women's Party, who are out to defeat the Roosevelt Administration and who expressed their confidence in *"a Republican victory, led by women."* They whisper significantly and loudly into the flapping receptive ears of the G.O.P. that *"the*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

woman's vote this year will outnumber the male vote." We should neither minimize the strength of the women's vote nor the special pleading that will be attempted to swing it into the camp of the defeatists.

It is absolutely true that the vote of the women will be a tremendous factor, actually decisive in the elections of 1944. The win-the-war forces can win or lose as the women's votes go in our country. A friend of mine says teasingly when I reiterate this continually, "God help the country!" It isn't a joke, though he meant it as one. It will be "God help us," if the women voters are neglected and consequently misinformed and misled politically. But if proper attention is paid by the C.I.O. Political Action Committee and all other cooperating groups immediately to the importance of the women and special machinery set up to reach them—we need not be alarmed. The job of the progressive win-the-war forces is to win the full understanding and support of the women voters. Millions are wives, mothers, sisters of men in our armed forces. They all want their men to vote, and if our present Congress succeeds in denying them the right—the indignation of their women folk will crystallize in a determination to turn out such sabotaging misrepresentatives. Women relatives are deeply concerned to vote right, adequately to represent their absent loved ones. The C.I.O. Women's Auxiliaries, cooperating with others, have undertaken to involve the women who are in the homes, in the campaign. The nine points of their servicemen's program, which is sponsored by labor generally, include soldiers' votes; mustering out pay; jobs and vocational training; adequate allowances for soldiers' dependents and disabled veterans, and for the families of men who give their lives in service; a health program of medical and hospital care for veterans and their families; and loans to veterans and merchant seamen to buy farms. Such a program represents the minimum we should insist upon for our soldiers and their families. Assurance of adequate care of soldiers' families and of returned soldiers is a tremendous lift to the morale of all concerned and satisfies an urgent need of millions of Americans. It is a source of deep anxiety. It must be a major political issue in 1944, especially for the women at home.

* * *

There are nearly eighteen million American women employed in war production and necessary civilian defense industry today. Over three million are members of trade unions. Their number will be increased, as the final all-out war efforts require greater production and the drafting of many more thousands of young men, including fathers. The women must replace their men as workers and as the support of the family. Women have proved beyond all question their ability in hundreds of new occupations. They are willing and capable. But the heaviest burden is in carrying a double load—the war job and the domestic job—care of the home and family. Mary Anderson, head of the Women's Bu-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reau of the Department of Labor, in her Labor Day statement said:— "This is a big sacrifice for them. Communities must increase their efforts to lighten this load by providing adequate civilian services such as laundries, restaurants, child care centers and transportation." The problem of child care remains an ever burning issue with women workers and will be increasingly so as young wives of soldier fathers enter shops. Some communities, like Detroit and Los Angeles, have succeeded in setting up excellent facilities. But the general complaint is that the age limit is too high. The under-two babies must be cared for in groups as they are in the U.S.S.R. and England. The other widespread difficulty is a need of educating the mothers to avail themselves of the day care centers, as a war service. There was considerable confusion relative to the Thomas Bill until the C.I.O. entered the Washington scene and definitely opposed it. Its position is to support H.R. 3206 introduced by Congressman Norton, amending the Lanham Act to permit the Federal Works Agency (which is doing quite a good job now—all that is being done nationally, in fact) to continue to administer funds for child care and to advise and assist in the development of a child care program. The C.I.O. opposes the Thomas Bill because it proposes to transfer Child Care from the Federal Works Agency to the War Man Power Commission, "a swapping of horses in midstream" the Wayne County C.I.O. Child Care Committee called it. Its statement continues: "There is also the danger that the Thomas Bill will attempt to solve the child-care problem through a foster-home program, which will be doomed to failure, since there are not nearly enough foster-homes available, and since group care is considered far more beneficial for children by leading education and child care authorities." This is an authoritative statement from Detroit, where thirty to forty-five thousand children need care, and is strongly endorsed by California's excellent C.I.O. Child Care Committee, headed by Mrs. Mary Mitchener. *Child care is the immediate major political demand for working mothers.* To the extent that the big unions consider it a union problem affecting health, morale, efficiency, the solution of which reduces absenteeism, sickness, and juvenile neglect—results are evident. Adequate federal and state legislation is required immediately.

But this is not the only demand of these women workers, who are conscious and articulate. The most effective way to arouse and give enthusiasm to the thousands already in trade unions and to reach many others, will be through the special women's committees of the C.I.O. Legislative Committee. In all instances we must boldly discuss their special needs, as we do those of the Negro people. Such committees are reported being set up by Mr. Hillman. Mr. Hillman will find no lack of capable enthusiastic women to "man" them. Mrs. Dorothy Bellanca, Vice President of the A.C.W. of A., points out the importance of integrating women into all the life and activity of the trade unions, and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the shortsightedness of assuming that women are only a labor reserve to be called out in emergencies and demobilized afterwards. Ruth Young, Executive Secretary of District No. 4, United Electrical Workers, proposes the inclusion in labor's political program of special reference to the employment and the rights of women, namely, equal pay; the right to work, to advance, and to be retained at new types of work; government responsibility for child care, maternity leave, proper health and safety provisions and adequate pensions for war widows who want to remain at home with their children.

Like the Negro people, women are alarmed at the prospect of wholesale dismissals after the war. Eighty per cent of the women in the Northwest shipyards say they expect to work after the war. Serious consideration must be given to the right and need of millions of women to work in the post-war period, and all post-war perspectives of necessity should include them and the Negro people. The possibility of post-war security and economic expansion opened up by the Teheran declaration must be made clear to the women, to overcome such fears and stimulate their wholehearted support for it. The threat of strife and conflict does not appeal to women as a postwar picture. Out of this war they deeply desire that there shall be security and peace—"the elimination of tyranny, and slavery, oppression and intolerance," a free, better, happier world for their children.

In this election "working together in the war and in the peace that will follow" can become a crusade among millions of American women, wives, mothers of soldiers; women in the industries, women in civilian defense and in our armed forces. Negro and white women—young and old, are stirred by the hope it creates. Teheran is a clarion call—it evokes the deepest and most enthusiastic response when it is understood in all its magnificent implications. To work to achieve its objectives against all opposition can become the guiding political purpose in 1944.

Harry Bridges, speaking to the C.I.O. Convention in California, said recently, *"We must change our thinking in relation to women."* Right now, in our preparation for political action, is a good time to apply this excellent advice. The women of the labor movement should never be overlooked but must be included in all work, if we are to reach effectively the millions of women who will be the decisive factor in 1944, to win the elections for Teheran.

International Women's Day, 1944, is an appropriate time to remember the words of one whom we could well emulate in his glowing enthusiasm on this subject, his faith in the ability of women, his persistence in drawing them rapidly into all public life, and his insistence on complete equality and the means to ensure it—that great leader of the people, Lenin. The achievements of Soviet women in peace and in war and the perspective of the great con-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tributions they will make to implement Teheran in the post-war world justify his faith and set us an example of what women, like men, are capable of doing when given the purpose and opportunity. American women will rise to the occasion. Our job is to help them understand it.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TEHERAN AND THE NEGRO PEOPLE

BY JAMES W. FORD

EARL BROWDER, in recent public addresses and in his profound and illuminating report to the January meeting of the National Committee of the Communist Party, has established beyond doubt this fundamental truth: that the Teheran conference agreements created conditions favorable for the advancement of American democracy, including solution of the problems of the Negro people.

In what general direction are the Negro people moving today for the solution of their problems, and how does the Teheran agreement advance this movement? How does this relate with larger currents of national and world affairs? To approach these questions, it is necessary to review briefly the manner in which the Negro question has been interwoven with the entire political development of American democracy.

In the first place, the unceasing struggle to solve the Negro question was not imposed upon us from without; it is a part of our history. It has been a continuous fight in which the noble and brilliant struggles of the Negro people, together with the participation of white Americans imbued with the high moral and practical precepts of American democracy, have built the heritage of the Negro liberation movement. This struggle has passed through many phases, but the change we are witnessing today far surpasses in magnitude any which took place in the years since the Civil War.

The Civil War victoriously concluded under the Administration of Lincoln, and the resultant adoption of the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution brought about a complete change in the relations between the Negro people and the nation as a whole. Following the Civil War, the Negro people aspired to become an integrated part of the American nation.

But a dozen years after the Civil War the Negro people, who had begun to make alliance with labor, were the victims of a great reactionary offensive. The consolidation of the power of the Northern bourgeoisie represented in the Republican Party made possible a change of policy from complete suppression of the former slave-owning class to collaboration with that class. In 1877 Republican President Hayes carried through this policy of collaboration with the former slave-owners. He returned the political

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rights of Negro citizens to the former slaveholders, as he expressed it, "upon their honor, as to the course touching the political rights of all citizens." This policy was made evident in the words of his inaugural address that he "would adopt a new policy on the Southern question . . . (and) withdraw from the South all national protection to the colored people." *

Thus, twelve years after the Civil War the South began to present a gloomy picture for the Negro people. The former slaveholders resumed their overlordship. The Ku Klux Klan policy of enmity, oppression, inequality, lynchings, mass brutality and incitement of race against race negated the democratic gains of the Negro people, and the betrayal by the Hayes Administration caused a profound shock to them.

Earl Browder, in a recent discussion of the Negro question, thus described this betrayal of 1877:

"It is, of course, known to you that the Negro people, after the Civil War, decided that their future lay in integrating themselves into the American nation as a whole. They expected to achieve this through the Republican Party, but they were sorely disappointed in this expectation. The Republican Party capitalized on the Negro vote by appearing in the historic role of liberator of the slaves. But it betrayed the Negro people after Lincoln's death. The Democratic Party, which had been the historic party of slavery, crushed the aspirations of the Negroes in the South with the connivance of the Republican Party." *

* * *

The struggle of the Negro people has more and more come to converge with the movement of labor and the common people as a whole for the safeguarding and extension of American democracy, and at the same time the participation of the Negro people in American economic, political, and cultural life has steadily increased.

Today Negroes are employed in almost all the skilled and semi-skilled occupations. If we were to examine carefully what this means in relation to the Negro's fundamental status in America today—in technological experience, in the process of economic stabilization, in political growth, and in contribution to the country's patriotic war—we would find that they have achieved a profoundly new status in American life. Advancements have been made by the Negro people in every phase of American life, assuring them a future on a footing of equality with all other Americans.

In the early stages of the war one could see that there would be a hard fight and many difficulties to overcome in order to make a dent against Negro discrimination. The weight of national oppression inherited from 1877 was lying heavily upon the Negro people. But during the course of the patriotic war a basic change was begun. A fight in

* James G. Blaine, *Twenty Years of Congress*, Vol. II, p. 595.

* "Self-Determination and the Negro Nation," by Earl Browder, *The Communist*, January, 1944, p. 83.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

defense of the dignity and rights of the Negro people has brought about a radical improvement in the situation. The latest Government reports show that out of the nearly six million Negro workers in this country, 1,500,000 are now employed in war industries. Nearly one-half of the employed Negro workers, or upward of a quarter of a million, enjoy membership in the organized trade union movement.

In the military sphere, a million Negroes are in the armed forces. As contrasted with the last war, Negroes are being used on a much broader scale; they are conscripted into every branch of the armed services — tank, aviation, Signal Corps, artillery, naval, marine, and so on. Negro aviators got their baptism in air warfare, for the first time in the history of the country, against the Germans over Sicily. The 99th Air Squadron of Negro aviators has recently achieved outstanding fame in our major theater of war. This squadron shot down more than sixteen German bombers over Italy. The Nazis exhibited deep indignation over the fact that American Negro airmen outfight the "superior Nordic Aryans." By this indignation the Hitlerites paid unwitting tribute to the policies that strengthen our armed forces and our nation against their calculations on division between white and black Americans. The Government's policies of increasingly integrating Negroes in our war industries and in our army of liberation (though much more needs to be done) strengthen our nation in the eyes of the colored peoples throughout the world.

In this patriotic war the democratic policies of President Roosevelt toward the Negro people are providing the basis for their full participation in the nation's war effort and for the solution of many of their problems. The policy of the Government against Negro discrimination in industry was established by the President's Executive Order 8802, issued on June 25, 1941. This policy has bettered the position of the Negro people in all phases of our national life. The order of the President's Fair Employment Practices Committee in December, 1943, to twenty-two railroads and seven Railroad Brotherhoods and A. F. of L. unions to end discrimination against Negroes was a decision of great importance in this respect. The full application of the policies of the F.E.P.C. can lead to the ending of the scourge of economic insecurity for Negro citizens.

* * *

Of great significance in the advancement of the Negro people in the national life of our country is their growing political maturity. They are helping to cement national unity behind the Commander-in-Chief. One of the most historic indications of political unity and progressive solidarity of Negro Americans is the "Declaration of Negro Voters," adopted in New York in November, 1943, by twenty Negro leaders of important organizations representing a cross section of the entire Negro population.

The declaration recognizes that the war is the chief issue confronting the country. It calls for:

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a. Full integration of the Negro into the armed forces without segregation.

b. The abolition of quotas by race.

c. A vigorous program of education in decent and democratic race relations.

d. A radically revised program for the acceptance of Negroes as commissioned officers, the use of Negroes in general and technical services, and the acceptance of Negro women of the WAVES, SPARS and Nurse Corps, without segregation.

e. Equal opportunity for Negroes to serve in combat service.

A highly significant part of the document, which breaks across party lines and strikes the national unity core of the 1944 elections, is the importance which the signers attached to the experiences of the Negro people during the 1943 elections. On this point the document states:

"In the 1943 elections the Negro voter played an important part in the election of a Negro Communist to the New York City Council, a Negro Republican Judge in the same community, a Democratic Mayor in Cleveland and a Republican Governor in Kentucky, with phenomenal manifestations of independent voting in many other important centers."

This is an outstanding document. In the light of the urgency of establishing the broadest national unity, this document in a statesmanlike manner charts a course for realizing the demands of the Negro people and for their alignment behind the win-the-war forces in the 1944 elections.

An outstanding example of maturing political relations between the Negro people and broad progressive political forces was the election of Benjamin J. Davis, Jr., Negro Communist, to the New York City Council. The election of Ben Davis was not a "racial" matter. It was brought about by Negro-white unity. It was a progressive coalition of trade unionists, white progressives and the Negro people, on the basis of a win-the-war program and for Negro equality.

These advances demonstrate that a basis has been established for strengthening political collaboration between the Negro people and the democratic and patriotic forces of the nation.

The strong ties which have been established between the trade union movement — particularly the C.I.O. — and the Negro people's organizations should be extended to strengthen political unity in the labor movement by close association with the Political Action Committee of the C.I.O. This will strengthen national unity as a whole and create more favorable conditions for hastening victory over the Axis and for full integration of the Negro people into American life.

Amity and fraternalism can and are being established between the nation as a whole and the Negro people. The history of the Negro people, their customs and cultural contributions—as in the instance of Paul Robeson, currently appearing in the leading role of "Othello" on the New York stage—are being brought forward to the entire nation in many ways. Racial animosi-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ties and the practice of playing race against race are being combated by ever larger sections of the American people. These struggles for interracial unity are being integrated with the struggles of all progressive and democratic forces for strengthening the national unity. The right of the franchise for all citizens to whom it is denied, white and black alike, is brought nearer to realization through united struggles. Americans are learning increasingly that the strength of the Soviet Union has as a main source the free and equal status of nations and peoples of the multi-national Socialist State.

The Teheran agreement in respect to economic problems has opened up tremendous possibilities for expansion of the domestic market and the market on a world scale, and can free us from fear of scarcity and unemployment after the war. The perspectives for economic expansion open up the South for unprecedented development that will raise the standard of living from the degradation and poverty which have held back the entire Southern people. The great political reforms which the Soldier Vote Bill and a successful struggle to abolish the poll-tax will bring about in the South will remove from political life those reactionary Congressmen from the South who represent forces that hold back the South economically and who spread fascist ideology and incite race hatred on the floor of Congress. If our Government continues its policy in the direction of abolishing racial discrimination, if it punishes violators of laws and Constitutional guarantees that protect Negro citizens from inequalities, if it carries into full effect the principles of the Atlantic Charter, then American democracy as a whole will be strengthened and the Negro people will be fully integrated into our American society. These advances will be irrevocably secured, providing the democratic, win-the-war forces, including the Negro people, stand solidly behind our Commander-in-Chief.

As for those disruptive forces that attempt to distort or completely discount these advances of the Negro people and thereby serve the divisive plans of the fascists, their aim is to disorient the Negro people, isolate them, and undermine the basis for their unity with the win-the-war forces and their integration with the nation as a whole. The most vociferous of these are the Trotskyites. Nobody but fascist-minded people or those directly in the service of fascism can fail to understand that the Negro people have everything to gain by aligning themselves with the democratic, win-the-war, national-unity forces. Against those who deliberately misrepresent the position of the Communist Party on the struggle for Negro rights, the words of Earl Browder ring out:

"One cannot reconcile himself even temporarily to the Jim Crow system. . . . These systematic violations of the rights of minorities serve to poison and distort the political, social and economic life of the entire nation. The fight to abolish these abuses is the business of all decent persons, and is not a series of special interests—it is a supreme national interest. . . .

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"On these issues we are in principle intransigeant, uncompromising, irreconcilable." *

The Trotskyite demagogic "defense" of the Negro people and the colonial masses against the alleged betrayal of the Communists is nothing but a cover-up for their anti-Soviet, anti-Teheran, anti-national unity attacks, aimed to help Hitler destroy the independence of the United States and bring death and destruction to the Negro people. The problems of the Negro people are tied up with the problems of the nation as a whole. The Negro people must fight jointly with the democratic win-the-war forces to destroy fascism. The Trotskyites know that a fascist victory would mean death for the Negro people. Yet they are helping the fascists by trying to cause disunity between the Negro people and their allies—the American people and all national unity forces.

Moreover, the Trotskyites try to smuggle in their anti-United Nations poison by distorting the Teheran decisions in respect to the colonial and semi-colonial masses. They say, for example, that Teheran "means the colored masses of Asia and Africa must give up the struggle for their national and social liberation." This of course is without foundation in fact. The statement on Iran which is a fundamental part of the Teheran agreement states:

"The three Governments realize that the war has caused special economic difficulties for Iran and they agreed that they will continue to make available to the Iran Government such economic assistance as may be possible. . . .

And further:

"With respect to the post-war period, the Governments of the United States of America, the U.S.S.R. and the United Kingdom are in accord with the Government of Iran that any economic problems confronting Iran at the close of hostilities should receive full consideration along with those of other members of the United Nations by conferences or international agencies, held or created, to deal with international, economic matters." *

Thus it can clearly be seen that this example of friendly collaboration between Iran and the Great Powers for raising the economic status of this semi-colonial country carries with it the agreement for the maintenance of its independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. The Teheran agreements laid the basis for mutual aid between all the nations of the United Nations and for the common advancement of their social, cultural and political aspirations. How significant this is for Ethiopia, which was reduced to a vassal country by the Italian fascist state!

The Negro people must not allow anyone to associate their just demands with pro-fascist demagogy. They must prevent the defeatists and obstructionists from breaking Negro unity for the carrying out of the Teheran declaration. They must

* Earl Browder, *Teheran and America*, Workers Library Publishers, 1944, p. 36.

* *The Communist*, January, 1944, p.93.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

present a solid front against Hitlerite policies and elements in the political field. They must make a careful analysis of the relation of forces in our national political life and make a careful estimate of the gains they have made under President Roosevelt.

They must associate themselves fully with the decisions of the Moscow-Teheran conferences and align themselves with those forces that support these decisions, and vigorously oppose those forces that are trying directly or indirectly to nullify them. The inescapable fact of history is that the whole future of mankind, including the Negro people, depends upon the defeat of Hitlerite Germany and her satellites.

The defeat of Hitler-Germany and the peaceful organization of the postwar world depend upon the continued firm unity of the American-Soviet-British coalition. In our own country, this Teheran objective calls for the solid unity of the nation behind President Roosevelt and the integration of the Negro people within the nation.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE I.L.G.W.U. AT THE CROSSROADS

BY ROSE WORTIS

THE events of Moscow, Cairo and Teheran have had profound repercussions in the trade unions and have posed before the workers new problems as to how best to cement labor's forces for the widest unity for the realization of the Teheran decisions. These problems present themselves in their most complicated form in unions under Social-Democratic leadership, of which the International Ladies Germent Workers Union is the outstanding example.

The I. L. G. W. U. is one of the largest unions in the A. F. of L., occupying a position of great importance and influence in the labor movement. It remains the broadest mass base for the Social-Democrats, with a following of thousands. This union has for years been the battleground for progressive policies. Because of the advanced character and the Socialist traditions of a large section of the membership, the sharpest struggle in the union in the past decade centered around basic political issues, such as the attitude toward the Russian Revolution, international labor unity, and collaboration between Socialists and Communists.

World events, in the past period, have resolved these differences of principle which divided the membership into Left and Right. There is unanimity among the overwhelming majority of the workers on the issues of the day. This was demonstrated during the recent visit of the Soviet Jewish delegation in our country. In the recent New York Councilmanic elections, thousands of I. L. G. W. U. members voted for the victorious Communist and progressive candidates, while their own Vice-President Ninfo went down to defeat as a result of his anti-unity position.

This unanimity among the workers has been further advanced since Teheran. However, workers who have been under the influence of Social-Democrats for twenty-five years do not break with all their prejudices overnight. The union leadership plays on these anti-Communist prejudices. Its main agitation today is that the Communists want to exploit the victories of the Red Army to "capture" the union.

* * *

During the period of friction and disagreement between our Government and the Soviet Union on the conduct of the war, because of the delay of the Second Front and the anti-Soviet intrigues on the part of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

certain elements in the State Department, the leadership of the I. L. G. W. U. still made their calculations on a possible break with the Soviet Union, despite their lip service to the Red Army. Their position was that wartime alliance with the Soviet Union was a "necessary evil," but that long-term collaboration with the Soviet Union was alien to American policy and American interests.

The Moscow and Teheran Conferences put an end to these false hopes and pernicious theories. It brought the union leadership face to face with the problem of its future course. This problem cannot be met with maneuvers. The policy of the union cannot be half for and half against Teheran. It cannot be for support of President Roosevelt and for maneuvers with Lewis and Dewey. It cannot be for international unity and for conspiring with Matthew Woll and William Hutcheson against such unity. It cannot be for unity and for continuing divisive tactics in the labor movement and within the union itself.

In approaching the union elections, the progressive forces in the union set themselves the objective, not merely to elect a more progressive, more representative leadership, but to change the course of the union on the basic issues. These are:

1. Support for the policies of Teheran, which in the labor movement means support for international labor unity and participation in the World Labor Conference to be held in London in June.

2. Support for President Roosevelt, which means labor's own unity and labor's broad collaboration with other pro-Roosevelt forces for the re-election of our President for a fourth term.

3. Determined struggle against John L. Lewis and the defeatists inside and outside the labor movement.

Agreement on these fundamental issues can lay the basis for constructive solution of the many economic problems of the union, which, though less acute today because of the "war prosperity," are basic to the future life of the union. It will also lay the basis for the solution of the problem of democracy in the union and autonomy for the hundreds of locals throughout the country, which today are dominated by appointees, very much on the style of Lewis' practice in the United Mine Workers.

The best guarantee of the effective execution of such policy is to wipe out the now artificial Left and Right divisions of the former period and establish the broadest friendly cooperation and unity in the ranks of the union.

* * *

In developing this policy, the progressives have encountered difficult problems due to inability to cope with the demagogy of the Dubinsky forces who, while formally approving the Teheran Agreement, continue the old Red-baiting and splitting line. Evidences are not wanting.

The General Executive Board at its November meeting greeted the Moscow Conference. *Justice,* the official organ of the union, greeted

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Teheran decision editorially in glowing terms:

"We cannot escape the fact that peace after this most terrible of all wars would be impossible without full cooperation with the Soviet Union. . . . Teheran dramatizes the world's hunger for understanding among leaders which is the requisite for understanding among people. . . . The Teheran conference did more than sharpen the sword of war —it built the first scaffold for a world at peace."

At meetings of the most important locals, the leadership introduced resolutions along similar lines. The program published by the administration groups of cloakmakers and dressmakers eulogizes the Red Army and repeats almost verbatim the economic program proposed by the progressive group.

Following the publication of the election program of the progressive group in Local 9, Manager Louis Hyman declared himself ready to accept the program of the progressives in toto and asked their support for his candidacy in the coming elections. But at that very meeting which adopted the pro-Teheran resolution, the chairman, a Dubinsky supporter, made a Red-baiting attack. The progressives saw the contradiction in such a policy—a policy of supporting unity in words and fighting it in deed—but did not know how to react. The same contradiction characterizes the general policy of the I. L. G. W. U. today.

At the General Executive Board meeting that endorsed the Moscow Conference decisions, Dubinsky fought against unity in the American Labor Party. He insisted that under no circumstances would he permit unity of various elements in any of the local unions. In his union he would give no quarter to the Communists, he is reported to have said. The struggle, he declared, was on with greater force than ever before: he personally would intervene in any local which defied his edict. This was no empty threat.

Since that Board meeting, Dubinsky has worked hard to whip his supporters into line. When his own efforts failed, he was given a helping hand by the notorious Social-Democrat N. Chanin, of "Shoot-the-Stalin-regime" fame. This splitting policy has already been put into effect in Dubinsky's own Local 10. Leading progressive workers such as Arnold Ames, Leo Unker, and others, have been framed up and eliminated as candidates for office. Through threats and promises of jobs Dubinsky has disrupted the movement for unity in the Italian Cloakmakers Union, throwing his support as President of the International to the most corrupt and discredited elements in the local. Officers who for years have loyally served the members are confronted with the alternative of either issuing a statement repudiating their views on basic policies of the union and their association with Communists or being eliminated from the leadership. The manner in which the leadership treats anyone who question its highhandedness is to be seen in the Italian Dressmakers Local 89, headed by the splitter of Italian unity, Vice President An-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tonini. At the recent nomination meeting the leader of an opponent group, a man known as a fascist sympathizer, who for years actively assisted Antonini in his anti-Communist crusade, was assaulted at a membership meeting by Antonini's present supporters and sent to the hospital.

The most shameful campaign of terror, unprincipled maneuvers, cajoling, and job bribing is going on (in this union hailed in certain liberal quarters as an example of democracy), all with but one objective—to continue division in the ranks of the workers and to prevent any Communist or progressive workers from breaking through Dubinsky's stranglehold in any of the local unions.

The same *Justice* that greets the Moscow Conference, in another issue attacks the Conference and carries pages of Red-baiting attacks by Antonini, against the Five-Party Coalition in Italy and the Free Italy Committee in our country. On many other issues of the day, the paper continues to print anti-Communist, Red-baiting articles and editorials. The same leadership which greets Teheran opposes international labor unity, in company with Woll and Hutcheson. In reply to the recent article in the Soviet magazine *War and the Working Class* attacking Dubinsky, the latter left the door somewhat open for reconsideration of his position. But it is a well known fact that Dubinsky's anti-unity position is not merely a matter of carrying out decisions of the A. F. of L. He, more than any other leader of the A. F. of L., is responsible for the failure of the A. F. of L. to join the Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee and the ineffectuality of Citrine's visit to the United States in 1942. The same leadership which states that it supports President Roosevelt still continues its scheming to bring Lewis back into the A. F. of L. and blocks unity in the American Labor Party, which may endanger the re-election of the President.

Some rank-and-file workers, not equipped to meet this double-dealing policy of Dubinsky, draw the conclusion that the general policy of the progressives, to conduct the election on the basis of a principled fight for policy and unity free from factional considerations, is incorrect, that this means abandoning the fight against Dubinsky's anti-unity, anti-United Nations policies. They see only one answer—to fight Dubinsky with his own factional weapons—an all-out fight along the old factional lines. This would be fatal. It would hinder the growing unity among the workers and play into the hands of those who are interested in continuing the present course in the union.

How, then, can this situation be met? How can the progressives advance their main objective of changing the course of the union? The answer to Hyman et al. must be: It is not enough for you gentlemen to write occasional editorials and give lip service to Teheran and unity. The test of the sincerity of your pronouncement is deeds.

The test of the sincerity of the acceptance of the Teheran decisions on the part of any labor union is its

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

position on international labor unity, national unity, the fourth term, the fight against readmission of Lewis into the A. F. of L., the unity of all anti-fascist elements within the union. On these concrete questions, which are the basis for bringing the Teheran decisions to life, the I. L. G. W. U. leadership has still taken no serious steps to modify its former anti-unity position. On the contrary, the trend seems to be in the opposite direction. Unless the fine words are supported by deeds, the workers will regard these declarations as misleading maneuvers by the present leadership to perpetuate itself in power and continue its disruptive work in the labor movement.

With this in mind, the progressive group addressed an open letter to the administration of Local 9. On the basis of the resolution adopted by the local and Hyman's unity speech, they asked that the local demand of President Dubinsky and the General Executive Board of the International that *Justice* refuse its pages to articles attacking the Moscow Conference; that it cease printing Red-baiting articles, which militate against the unity of the workers and the anti-fascist struggle; that the union break its alliance with John L. Lewis and fight against his readmission into the A. F. of L., that the International support the call of the British Trade Union Congress for the World Conference in London and bring its influence to bear for A. F. of L. participation; that the International mobilize the full membership for the President's stabilization program, the soldiers' vote, elimination of the poll tax, etc; that the local go on record for unity in the ranks of the American Labor Party on the basis of the Hillman proposal; that the local do away with the shameful practices of favoritism and of discrimination against progressives; that it unite the entire membership for the effective execution of this program.

The letter concludes by stating that the proposals above are in full accord with the resolutions adopted by the Executive Board and the speech of the manager. On the basis of such program, the progressives declare their readiness to cooperate with the administration and all other elements in the union.

It is only through such an approach that the progressives will make it more difficult for the leadership to maneuver on basic issues. Thus the broad unity forces will convince every honest worker and leader that they are not interested in controlling or capturing the union but have as their sole interest to help make the union a more powerful instrument to advance unity and victory.

Some progressives have raised the question: What if the leadership of the union agrees in regard to the main issues of the war but still continues the policy of discrimination, persecution and exclusion of progressives and Communists from the life and leadership of the union, are we ready to submit? The answer to this question is to be found, not by isolating the question of the union leadership's attitude to Communists and progressives in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the union, but in seeing this issue in its interrelationship with the basic policies. We can invoke the recent experiences of our nation in evolving its foreign political policies and the experiences of the I. L. G. W. U. itself.

So long as our country and Britain hesitated in their policy of full collaboration with the Soviet Union, withheld agreement for military action in unison with the Soviet Union and permitted anti-Soviet trends in the government to mar our relations with our Soviet ally, the logic of their position led them to support the Darlans and Mikhailoviches. The clarification of our policies on the conduct of the war, and the long-term collaboration with the Soviet Union, simultaneously brought a change in our attitude to the democratic forces in other countries, as instanced by the recognition of Tito and the improvement of relations with de Gaulle. Support for Teheran is visibly leading the Administration to change its policy of appeasing reactionaries and to depend more on the democratic forces at home.

What is true of the developments of unity nationally and internationally applies with equal force to the labor movement and also to the I. L. G. W. U. This is proved by the very experience of this union itself in the past years. When, in 1935, the leadership of the I. L. G. W. U. supported the C. I. O. when it showed solidarity with the anti-fascist struggle in Spain, when there was agreement on basic issues, this logically led to greater unity in the union itself. During that period the bars against Communists were removed, united administrations of Socialists and Communists were elected in many of the most important locals of the union. Had this policy continued, the I. L. G. W. U. today would be among the most progressive unions in the country. The withdrawal of the union from the C. I. O. (opposed by the Communists within the union) arrested this development and turned the union from its proper course. It brought about a renewal of Red-baiting and division. The union leadership once more began to depend upon a more backward and careerist element and stifled rank-and-file expression.

A basic change in the course of the union now, which will bring it back to the progressive, win-the-war camp, will also lead to the abandonment of the policy of exclusiveness, and result in greater democracy in the life of the union.

Despite Dubinsky's struggle against unity, there is a growing unity movement in the ranks of the workers.

In the Cloakmakers Local 117—politically, for many years, the most important local of the union—where our late Comrade Joseph Boruchovitch was the outstanding leader, the Boruchovitch tradition continues. Despite the intervention of Dubinsky and of Chanin, of the *Jewish Daily Forward* anti-Soviet clique, to prevent unity, leading Social-Democratic workers have joined hands with Communists on a unity program. The same is true in Local 9 and a number of other important locals. To quote from an

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

open letter signed by twenty-five leading workers who describe themselves as Right-Wingers:

"We were never Left-Wingers and we are not Left-Wingers now. . . .

"We feel that the time has come to end the strife among the members of our union. We feel that the time has come to do away with the cursed splits of Right and Left. . . .

"We, the undersigned, would be overjoyed if the union established full unity because we are convinced such unity can be established, but our leaders don't want to see this. . . .

"As far as the 'Communist menace' is concerned, we believe that this is just a means of throwing sand in the eyes of cloakmakers to confuse and divide them. We believe that drawing in the red herring will not add to the life of our union. It is just a means of further dividing the workers. At this moment whoever tries to divide the workers acts as an enemy of the cloakmakers and not as their friend."

If the progressives could secure an honest election, a major demand of the workers, the unity forces in these locals have every chance of emerging victorious. The Dubinsky forces are hard at work to prevent the free expression of the membership in the elections.

This so-called democratic union has instituted a procedure for elections which violates the most elementary principles of trade union democracy. The progressive forces, with few exceptions, are given no representation on the committees which conduct the elections, so that the entire election machinery is left in the hands of the administration. In addition, the administration has devised a new scheme to thwart the will of the membership and to divide them artificially into distinct groups through the institution of the block system of voting, through which workers vote for slates instead of choosing individual candidates from all slates, as was the procedure of the union throughout the years. This procedure of the past is the only real democratic form of elections in a trade union, where strict party divisions do not exist. This new procedure of block-voting is especially repugnant to the workers now, when old divisions between "Right" and "Left" no longer have any meaning, when all workers are agreed on the main issues of policy, and when the only question to be determined is which individual candidate will most effectively and most sincerely carry through these policies.

While the real obstacle to unity comes from the leadership of the I.L.G.W.U., the sharp internal struggle long fostered by the leadership has brought about a situation in which the progressives have not entirely freed themselves from their past attitude of viewing with a certain mental reservation workers known as "Right-Wingers" with whom they had political differences. These tendencies must be ruthlessly eliminated. The progressives have the responsibility of encouraging the most friendly relations among all workers of the union around common objectives.

This narrow approach to fellow-workers is not limited to the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I.L.G.W.U. Remnants of this still exist elsewhere, as was indicated in recent elections in other unions. This approach flows from failure to understand the full implications of Teheran with its perspectives of long-term collaboration with the more conservative forces of the win-the-war camp, who may still have ideological differences with the progressives, and some of whom may still be influenced by anti-Communist ideology.

It is only through a deeper understanding of world developments so brilliantly elaborated in the report of Earl Browder at the Plenum of the National Committee of our party that we can help the progressive forces to realize fully the broad perspective open for them to collaborate with other forces in the labor movement and win them to acceptance of all constructive elements, including the Communists.

The I.L.G.W.U. is an organization of over three hundred thousand. The Social-Democratic clique will leave no stone unturned to influence the policies of the union's convention, which is due to take place in June, on the eve of the Presidential nominating conventions. The progressives in the union face many difficult and complicated problems. It is only by placing the vital issues before the broadest section of the members, scrupulously avoiding all partisan considerations, that the progressives will not only achieve favorable results in the elections but force a change in the course of the union. The Communists in the I.L.G.W.U., in common with all other honest workers, have but one aim—to win the I.L.G.W.U. back to the path of progress and unity, to make it a force for victory and the realization of the Teheran objectives.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NATIONAL UNITY AND THE FARMERS

BY FRED BRIEHL

BETWEEN the millions of people engaged in agriculture and the greater millions engaged in industry there is a complete interdependence. Statistics of the Department of Agriculture point out that sales of farm products rise and fall almost automatically with the changes of income in the urban and industrial centers. Senate document 106 (Report to the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning) states:

"In the case of meats and dairy products the relationship is so close that the indices of their volume of sales and of urban incomes are almost *one line on a chart*. For example, at the beginning of 1923 the index of incomes of city people was about 84 per cent of the 1924-29 average, and the volume of retail sales of meats and dairy products at that time showed an index of about 85 per cent on the same basis. Both indices gradually went up until the spring of 1929 when the two of them stood *almost exactly at* 110 per cent. Then came the precipitous decline until 1933 when urban incomes were about 58 per cent of the base years and sales of these farm products were about 63 per cent. Since that time both of them have *climbed together* until the spring of 1941, on the chart, when one of them had an index of 118 per cent and the other one of about 120 per cent. *There could be no more striking example of the extent to which the welfare of the farmers is tied to the scale of incomes of urban and industrial workers*" (emphasis mine—F.B.).

Logically, such mutuality should be reflected on the political field. Yet it is exactly here that we find an alarming and dangerous contradiction, a marked isolationism on the part of each toward the other. Far too long has this condition been tolerated. With events on the international and national scene moving at a terrific tempo, a continuation of this separation is certain to bring circumstances fearful even to contemplate. On this score, no less an authority than Vice-President Henry A. Wallace, at a meeting of labor leaders on January 15, was reported in the New York *Times* on January 16 as follows:

"The Vice-President, after citing the interdependence of the two groups, and declaring that the farmers would not get legislation without the aid of labor, asserted that 'the so-called leaders of agriculture in Congress do not speak for the rank and file of farmers, thank God for that!' . . .

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"He recently made a tour of many counties in his home state of Iowa, Mr. Wallace said, and had emphasized the great need of the farmers understanding labor.

" 'The satisfaction of their needs in the postwar period,' he said he told them, 'depended on production,' and they would not 'get legislation without the labor men and their Congressmen lined up.' "

Actually, what of a political nature did take place among our farming population in the past number of years? The field has been left entirely for the "grazing" of the non-progressive elements of the nation. And the choosing of this field by the reactionaries is no accident. It is done with malice aforethought, upon the realization that there is no opposition. Farm Bloc groups control directly the main sources of propaganda reaching the farmers, as the Gannett chain of newspapers and a number of farm journals circulating in millions of copies. At the same time they have intimate contact with sundry farm leaders, so called, who in turn exercise their backward influence on the rank and file. Rural newspapers, with some exceptions, follow this same pattern. The radio, because of its greater variety of program, is less to be condemned on this count.

The purpose of this group is obvious. President Roosevelt, in a recent message to Congress, put it in the following and entirely appropriate terms:

"While the majority goes on about its great work without complaint, a noisy minority maintains an uproar of demands for special favors for special groups. There are pests which swarm through the lobbies of the Congress and the cocktail bars of Washington, representing these special groups as opposed to the basic interests of the nation as a whole. They have come to look upon the war primarily as a chance to make profits for themselves at the expense of their neighbors—profits in money or in terms of political or social preferment.

"Such selfish agitation can be highly dangerous in wartime. It creates confusion. It damages morale. It hampers our national effort. It muddies the waters and therefore prolongs the war."

We see from this that the President is an obstacle in the path of the Farm Bloc; therefore they find it necessary to fight his program and policies. Knowing they require some mass support to give their position "authority," they come into the rural areas with their pleas. Labor, unfortunately, is unaware of how the farmers are being operated upon by these "pests." Just a couple of examples to make the point.

Organized labor unanimously went on record in support of food subsidies as a means of stabilizing the home front and holding down the cost of living as good war economy. How did the so-called Farm Bloc present this to the farmers? A consumer subsidy at the farmer's expense! Coddling organized labor for votes while holding the farmers to price ceilings when the "law of supply and demand" was so ripe for the farmers! A direct subsidy to the farmers was a cheap and evident

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trick to buy off the farmers and if the farmers fell for this "dole" in place of fair prices the public was better able to pay than ever before the farmers would lose their self-respect and decency; they would become "the slaves of the government"!

A second example, related to the above—widely publicized labor income charts compared with cost of living charts "showed" to farmers how labor was riding high, wide and handsome. These graphs indicated how wages soared far above farm income. (How these graphs were doctored is a story in itself.) In effect, they claimed, organized labor and the government were one and the same thing; the farmer was being left out in the cold and yet he was expected to do his just share (and then some) in the war effort!

The Administration is depicted as "a bunch of bungling bureaucrats," "Socialists" and "Communists," "theorists and college professors," "spendthrifts and dictators."

Let us admit that this vicious propaganda, without any antidote, left its imprint on the farmers' minds.

The following figures give an indication of this pernicious influence and should give us much food for thought and incentive to action. The great farm belt comprises 1,058 counties or roughly one-third of all counties in the U.S. In 1932, only 121 of these counties went Republican. In 1936, 236 went Republican; in 1940, 763 went Republican. Recent Gallup estimates state that 925 of the 1,058 counties are Republican. This is an alarming indication of the danger ahead. In the last New York State election, we had another specific indication. We must not forget that the 320,000 plurality given General Haskell in New York City was insufficient to stem the Republican avalanche that rolled down from the upstate counties, electing Dewey's man Hanley as Lieutenant Governor. These are clear-cut instances of how a preconditioned rural vote can restrict and block the strengthening and progress of the national unity, to the disadvantage both of labor and of the farming population itself. No one can truthfully say that the farmers do so intentionally.

In view of this, is it correct to say that the reason we have a Smith-Connally Act, an anti-subsidy vote, a "Farm Bloc" in Congress, a Hamilton Fish and a Martin Dies as Representatives, is due in considerable measure to the neglect by progressive forces (particularly labor) to reach the farming population with a constructive political message meeting the needs of national unity?

The farm population of America compromises roughly one-fouth of the total. Important as this is, we should be conscious always that they are the producers of the first essential of life—food. It is to the primary interest of all that farmers be enabled to produce in abundance and variety to meet war and postwar needs. Farmers are anxious to do just that. Farmers are a tremendous market for the products of the factory: everything from innumerable farm machinery and equipment and building material to household

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

furnishing and some personal "luxuries." Here is a great market to give employment to labor. On the other hand, employed labor with a satisfactory pay envelope and the Teheran objectives which involve relieving and rehabilitating the devastated countries after the war, are the best assurance to farmers of a market for the produce from the land. This requires great emphasis, which at the present time can be brought to the farmers chiefly by labor's organizations.

We are in a world-shaking war, with a crucial national election before us. The decisions at Teheran point the way to victory and an enduring peace. Toward this the eight points on economic security in President Roosevelt's recent message to Congress on the State of the Union are directed.

This portion of the message reads as follows:

"We have come to a clear realization of the fact that true individual freedom cannot exist without economic security and independence. 'Necessitous men are not free men.' People who are hungry and out of a job are the stuff of which dictators are made.

"In our day these economic truths have become accepted as self-evident. We have accepted, so to speak, a second Bill of Rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all —regardless of station, race or creed. Among these are:

"The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries, or shops or farms or mines of the nation;

"The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation;

"The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living;

"The right of every business man, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad;

"The right of every family to a decent home;

"The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health;

"The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident and unemployment;

"The right to a good education."

* * *

President Roosevelt has here set before us, in terse and simple words, an alluring prospect. The term "alluring" is used here advisedly when we appreciate how possible of attainment is the above program. It is an all-inclusive program, appealing to farmers and labor, as well as to industrialists. However, programs, be they ever so excellent, can only have meaning when wedded to action. Progress is not made by keeping ideas in a perpetual dream-stage. The path of action in this instance is not difficult to determine. Upon labor, as the cementing force in the national unity, devolves a series of important tasks.

1. The labor movement can take the initiative in helping to establish a broad farm center for the national unity, win-the-war farm forces. The exact organizational form this can

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

take will be determined by the farm leaders.

2. The labor movement can take the initiative in helping to influence the Democratic Party leaders, so that the Democratic Party may adopt a vigorous and positive approach to the farm vote in 1944.

3. The labor movement has a right to expect, and can be helpful in seeing to it, that Administration farm spokesmen continuously bring to the farmers, and adequately explain, the content and significance of the Administration farm policy and program. It is also reasonable to insist that government farm officials and employees charged with responsibility for achieving the war food program carry through in a consistent and thorough manner the government farm policy and program.

4. Labor can establish friendly relations with farm organizations and take the initiative in securing joint or parallel action, wherever areas of agreements are established. County, city and state labor bodies, as well as united labor and community committees, can each approach the farm organizations in their areas for such agreement and action.

* * *

That there is a real basis for this broad approach was shown by some of the actions taken at the recent National Grange Convention. This convention reported the largest membership in its history, 600,000. Some people shy away when the national leadership of the Farm Bureau or Grange is mentioned. This makes it all the more necessary to emphasize some interesting aspects of the Grange National Convention.

Before the war the scope of interest of the national Grange leadership in international affairs was reflected in the usual resolutions against "entangling alliances" and for adequate defense. This year National Master Goss in his annual address emphasized the role the farmers should play in the establishment of a just peace and in the prevention of future wars through international cooperation. The postwar committee reported to the convention a recommendation "in favor of a declaration of policy by Congress to join the United Nations in an effort to preserve peace." It also expressed itself "in favor of the general objective of the United Nations Food and Agricultural Conference to bring about an era of abundance based upon stable and prosperous agriculture." It also declared itself "In favor of conferences between the representatives of general farm organizations of the U.S. and other countries, to discuss common interests, including programs that will assure a sufficiently balanced and well-arranged program of distribution of farm products to the consumers of the world as a basis upon which to develop a sound agricultural policy for American agriculture in relation to the rest of the world; and that the National Master and Executive Committee be instructed to initiate contact with said general farm organizations to the end that an international conference of general farm organizations be called." In relation to specific domestic agricultural policy,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the National Grange went on record for continuing and expanding the crop insurance program and the rural electrification program; it favored securing Federal Social Security benefits to farmers and farm labor, and continuing the Farm Security Administration for fighting the revenue amendment that is an entering wedge to open the cooperatives to federal income tax (the same amendment applies to the trade unions); and it opposed a national sales tax. Noteworthy, too, is the fact that the National Grange went on record for, and features in its official publication, active support for Russian War Relief.

It would be one-sided, however, not to note here certain negative features of Grange policy, reflected at the Convention, such as the opposition to subsidies. But it is the positive features of the Convention tnat need emphasis in that they can be a basis for firmly integrating the farmers in the national unity.

To no less degree must we notice the decisions reached by the Board of Directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation, adopted at a quarterly meeting on September 3, 1943. The following, from a document entitled "A Guide to Post-War Planning," deserves the attention of all national unity forces:

"Article III. We favor domestic policies that will assure *full production* and *full employment,* which will result in constantly rising living standards for all groups. To attain this objective, an equitable balance in purchasing power among all groups must be manitained. We believe that this can best be accomplished by industry, labor and agriculture through voluntary adoption of price and wage policies based on a philosophy of *abundance*. . . .

"Article VI. We favor adjustment or removal of foreign and domestic barriers so as to facilitate the maximum exchange of goods and services between nations, and between groups in our own country, to the end that *maximum employment and production* may be achieved throughout the world. . . .

"Article XI. Neither agriculture, labor, nor industry can solve their own problems without giving due consideration to the problems of the others. The goal of full production and full employment through private enterprise can only be attained through their cooperation and their support of nationwide policies and plans directed toward the good of all instead of each striving to obtain a position of monopolistic advantage. We therefore urge that all possible efforts be made by industry, agriculture, and labor to promote better relationships and more effective cooperation between these great economic groups for the common welfare. We call on all groups to join in conference to sincerely seek the solution of our mutual problems in the interest of the nation as a whole."

Taking these statements at their face value, we find in them supporting weight to the eight points as presented by President Roosevelt. The call on all groups to "join in conference" is an invitation that labor should accept. It must not be ignored!

While we should be fully aware of the negatives in both the Grange and Farm Bureau top leadership,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we need to fix our attention on every possibility for unity and agreement with both. It is the *area* of agreement rather than the points of difference that need emphasis. These areas of agreement exist even with the national leadership of these organizations and contact with the labor movement and other win-the-war forces can develop further existing areas of agreement.

Let no one harbor the mistaken idea that the farmers as a group are reactionary. They may be confused, but certainly not reactionary. Labor must avoid the attitude that labor "is going to do something for the farmers." There must be rather a clearcut understanding through contact and education, that unity of action between these two groups means the improved welfare of the whole nation. The farmer will understand and accept this.

Fully comprehending the need, the detailed plan will find its own channels; conferences of leaders, use of press and radio, etc. The problem must be taken out of the talking stage and put in motion. Yes, it will require effort and finances, but they will pay real dividends. Serious attention to farmer-labor unity carried on persistently and consistently can result in a great progressive upsurge in our nation.

* * *

There is little sense in thinking of the Teheran declarations unless we think and move on the manifold steps necessary to bring them to realization. The tasks ahead for this are colossal. The requirements for foodstuffs and manufactured articles run into astronomical figures. Nazi-occupied Europe with its 575 millions, China with its 460 millions, and India with its 350 millions, offer a market now and for a long time to come for the maximum production of American agriculture and industry. This will, without question, reflect itself to the advantage of American producers. This is one important reason why Teheran has such meaning — the wholesome friendly cooperation of nations in a postwar period to make this commerce possible. This must be burned deeply in the consciousness of the American people, farmers and labor, professionals and businessmen alike. The thought must be parent to the deed.

In conclusion, we are now already in the swing of the 1944 elections. The people of our nation and the democratic world have Victory and a better post-war world firmly established in their hearts and minds. The Moscow and Teheran decisions have marked the goal. President Roosevelt's address to Congress has set the signpost for this nation. Our party, through Earl Browder's report and the National Committee Plenum decisions, has spoken to the working class and the nation. It is the historic way for the American people. It is the only way! Advance along this road will be furthered by farmer-labor unity on win-the-war issues and candidates.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PLANS FOR CURRENCY STABILIZATION

BY EUGENE VARGA

OF SPECIAL interest among post-war economic problems is the question of currency stabilization. Undoubtedly, there is a danger of general devaluation of currencies as was the case after the first World War. At the present time it is quite clear that when the war is over European countries will be threatened by a new currency devaluation.

A situation of this kind is bound to arise after the war unless timely measures are taken to prevent the threatened devaluation of money. This problem is the subject of lively discussion in the foreign press, and a number of schemes have been advanced, the most important of which are, first, the British scheme drafted by the well-known economist Keynes, providing for the setting up of an international clearing union; and secondly, the American plan, elaborated by White, which calls for the creation of a huge stabilization fund, and international bank.

The Keynes plan takes into account the special position of Britain.

Implementing the Keynes plan would undoubtedly help Britain to recover the role of international banker in the post-war period, although stabilizing currencies on an international scale could never be secured by means of the creation of an international clearing union.

The existence of an international clearing union could, to a certain extent, modify or postpone foreign devaluation, but could not eliminate it. The Keynes plan alone cannot secure currency stability after the war. Only with the continuation of government restriction on individual consumption and investment, with strict control of foreign trade, and also with extensive capital export from rich countries to countries ruined by war, could the aim of the Keynes plan of currency stabilization be achieved. But the employment of all these means—which incidentally are hardly possible of realization in peacetime under the existing social system, inasmuch as they run contrary to the selfish interests of influential circles—could secure a stable currency without an international clearing system.

The White plan was submitted to the Senate in April, 1943, by Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury. The central idea of this plan consists in the mobilization of international finance, the turnover of the huge gold stock in the U.S.A. which finds no use at the present time. It proposes, in the first place, a five thousand million dollar currency

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fund as a basis for stabilization. This fund is to be formed from shares payable by all member states.

There is no doubt that the currency fund planned by White could become a substantial factor in world economy, and secure currency stabilization more effectively than the clearing union proposed by Keynes.

The leading position envisaged for the U.S.A. by the White plan not only rests on the anticipation of the U.S.A. being the dominant partner in the currency fund, the British press stresses, but also on the anticipated participation of the countries of Central and South America, which are under the strong economic and political influence of the U.S.A. In addition to the stabilization fund, the White Plan also provides for the organization of a bank for reconstruction and development by the United Nations and nations joining them. Undoubtedly the planned bank, together with the currency fund, would represent a tremendous economic power.

But precisely because of this there is considerable opposition to this plan, not only outside, but also inside the U.S.A. For fully understandable reasons, even stronger objections to the White Plan are raised in Britain.

Compromise between the two plans is hardly possible, since Keynes is trying to solve the problem of stabilization of currency by eliminating gold, and White on the basis of gold; moreover, both these plans correspond to the special economic interests of their respective countries.

Naturally, Soviet public opinion cannot but be interested in economic plans of post-war reconstruction discussed in the countries of our allies. The special character of the economic system of the Soviet Union determines its attitude to the question of the stabilization of currencies. As a state engaged in foreign trade, the Soviet Union, just as Britain or the U.S.A., is interested in the stability of the currencies of the countries it is trading with, in preventing currency speculation in other countries from interfering with the normal course of foreign trade.

If all the Soviet Union's trade with the rest of the world could be conducted on the basis of gold currency with an unchanging value, this would undoubtedly render trading operations easier.

As regards the Soviet Union's currency, it is known that here prices—and consequency also the purchasing power of the ruble — in the state trade turnover, are fixed by plan. This means that the stability of Soviet currency is secured by methods entirely different from those in other countries. This also obviates the possibility of any kind of proposals in the field of economic policy as far as the Soviet Union is concerned by any future organization, be it international bank or currency fund.

On the other hand, the Soviet Union is undoubtedly interested in the beginnings of measures capable of accelerating the restoration of her economy, as well as of the economies of other countries devastated by the fascist brigands.

This question is of the greatest importance in estimating the financial plans on the part of the Soviet Union.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

JAPANESE-GERMAN RELATIONS DURING THE SECOND WORLD WAR*

BY A. ZHUKOV

RELATIONS between Germany and Japan are quite different from Germany's relations with her European satellites. Japan has never been Hitler Germany's vassal. Aggressive plans induced Japan to seek rapprochement with Hitlerite imperialism. But in the process of such rapprochement Japan's ruling circles by no means intended meekly to follow the course of German policy, subordinating themselves to its terrific aims to the detriment of their own interests.

To get a correct idea of the character of Japanese-German relations it is useful to turn to history. [After tracing the history of German colonial expansion in the east, the author continues:] German imperialism calculated on using Japan's growing military and economic strength to the detriment of the latter's interests. At the end of the 19th century Japan, according to German plans, was to serve as a kind of counter-balance to Russia in the Far East. German diplomacy systematically tried to incite Russia against Japan.

The hostility of German imperialism toward Japan did not prevent Wilhelm II, on the eve of the first World War, from calculating that he would succeed in inciting Japan against Britain and Russia. But German diplomacy did not succeed in playing up Anglo-Japanese economic contradictions in China, already evident in that period.

After defeat in the first World War, German imperialism began immediately after the end of that war to prepare for revenge. At the beginning Japan maintained quite a reserved attitude as regards the revival of German imperialism, as she by no means intended to part with the German colonial heritage acquired after the first World War.

As the designs of German imperialism against the interests of the Soviet Union, Britain, France, Czechoslovakia and other democratic countries acquired more and more concrete form, Japan discovered more and more benefits for herself in the revival of imperialist Germany.

Hitler's advent to power was followed by greater political and economic penetration of the Germans in the Far East. Japanese militarists watched Germany's growing ac-

* Abridged reprint from the Soviet journal *The War and the Working Class.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tivity in Far Eastern affairs with a certain jealousy. But the logical development of international events induced the aggressive elements in Japan and Germany to engage in a certain amount of collaboration.

The comparatively easy capture of Manchuria greatly encouraged imperialist aspirations of the Japanese militarists. The changed correlation of forces in East Asia testified to the comparatively weak opposition to Japanese claims on the part of the democratic powers—Great Britain and the United States. This impelled Japan and Germany to joint, or at the beginning parallel, action against the democratic powers.

November 25, 1936, saw the signing of the so-called "Anti-Comintern Pact" between Germany and Japan. Considerable sections of public opinion in Britain, U.S.A., and France viewed the officially announced aims of Japanese-German collaboration with understandable distrust. Nevertheless the "Anti-Comintern Pact" caused no particular alarm in Britain or the U.S.A.

In the summer of 1937 Japan attacked China. The German fascists had dreamed of an entirely different war, of inciting Japan against the Soviet Union. Moreover, the Japanese attack on China in the summer of 1937 evoked a definitely negative reaction in certain German circles directly connected with China. But the Hitlerite Government in an effort to incite Japan against the Soviet Union at any price decided temporarily to sacrifice the interests of the German exporters to China for this aim.

On September 1, 1939, the European war broke out. On September 7, 1939, Japan declared her "non-intervention in the European War."

Following France's capitulation Japan erroneously concluded that the strategic positions of the democratic powers, Great Britain in particular, were so weakened that there would be sense in discarding the policy of "abstinence" from participation in the world war. Encouraged by Germany's example, the Japanese aggressor began to exert systematic pressure on French and Dutch colonial territories, primarily upon French Indo-China and the Dutch East Indies.

On September 27, 1940, the three-power pact was signed in Berlin, laying the basis for military and political alliance of the aggressor states. For Japan, her alliance with fascist Germany was one of the means of the realization of her own political plans. Japan wanted to take advantage of the aggressive acts of Germany and her European satellites, which tied down the forces of the democratic powers, for ousting her weakened rivals and competitors from territory coveted in East Asia.

Fascist Germany in turn calculated that Japanese imperialism would undertake a diversion against the eastern colonial rear of Britain and the United States, thereby facilitating the success of the Hitlerite plans of world conquest. Apart from this, Hitlerite Germany expected Japan to undertake military operations also against the Soviet Union.

But along with the pro-fascist ele-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ments trying to propel Japan along the path of an anti-Soviet war, there were also elements in Japan capable of a more sober estimate of the real possibilities and prospects. In her relations with the Soviet Union Japan manifested common sense.

After years of preparation for war for domination of the Pacific, Japan considered the Hitlerite aggression in Europe an unprecedently favorable opportunity to effect new important territorial conquests without special risk. But Japan greatly miscalculated, banking upon Hitler in the vain hope that "invincible" Germany was capable of undermining the military might of Britain and the United States.

Japan embarked upon military operations against the United States and Britain just when the Red Army began the counter-offensive which led to the defeat of the Hitlerite hordes at Moscow. In a comparatively brief time the Japanese captured a number of important territories. With obvious envy and even poorly concealed annoyance the Hitlerite brigands watched Japan capture the richest Far Eastern colonies and all this at a time when Fascist Germany was engaged in hard, "total" war against the countries of the democratic coalition without any significant support from Japan. . . .

Hitlerite dissatisfaction was aggravated by the fact that Japan's colonial seizures during the first half of 1942 included also territories which some time ago were taken from Germany. . . .

For a long time Chandra Bose was maintained in the Berlin incubator for Quislings. His initial activity was of so openly a pro-Hitlerite character that the Japanese soon hastened to find their own claimant to the role of All-India Fuehrer, Behari Bose, less known than the Berlin Bose, with doubtless the advantage of being closer to the country. For several months there were also two "centers" of subversive activity and pseudo-nationalist demagogy for India: German in Berlin and Japanese in Singapore.

The rout of the Hitlerites at Stalingrad and the Caucasus shattered the Germans' rosy dreams of the possibility of reaching Iran and India through the Caucasus. Hitlerite diplomacy decided on a magnificent gesture toward Japan which temporarily gave up independent intrigues in India. With much noise the Berlin Bose was "ceded" to Japan and the Hitlerites sent him to Tokyo.

Unquestionably, Hitler Germany is not overpleased with her Far Eastern ally both as regards its active part in the war against Britain and its complacency in the matter of political problems. Japan is not harming the military and economic potential of the United States and Britain to an extent which could affect Germany's position. Japan is restricting her participation in the war to local, although large scale, operations in Southeastern Asia. Japan is pursuing her own aims and apparently has no intention of coordinating her East Asia affairs with Hitler's strategic plans.

It is impossible to conceal Japanese-German differences in estimat-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing the general military situation. There is a growing disappointment in Japan as regards Germany's military might. Indisputably, Japan expected far greater benefit from the German Army in the war against the United States and Britain.

The Hitlerites are equally disappointed in their Japanese ally primarily because Japan manifested adequate political foresight to refrain from joining Hitler's military gamble against the Soviet Union.

Japanese-German relations inevitably have been affected by the great shock suffered by the German war machine and the fall of the prestige of Hitlerism. Nevertheless, it must be remembered that the military reverses of Hitler Germany are exerting a contradictory influence on Japanese-German relations. On the one hand, the Axis partners are losing confidence in each other and the differences in the aims of their policy become clearer and clearer. On the other hand, the Japanese-German military alliance remains in force.

Japan fears the consequences which will follow from the rapid and complete defeat of German imperialism. Germany, in turn, is interested more than ever in preserving her military alliance with Japan. At the present stage of the war Germany and Japan are interested in prolonging hostilities as much as possible, in delaying the conclusion of the war inasmuch as its end threatens most unpleasant consequences for them.

Both Germany and Japan were able to score successes at a certain stage but these successes were determined only by transient favorable factors. On the vast plains of Russia the Hitlerites irrevocably lost their advantages. Evidence shows that Japan's temporary advantages also have receded into the realm of the past. Japan has lost the strategic initiative and now has to recall the old Eastern proverb: "He who rides the tiger will find it hard to dismount." At any rate, Japan can no longer count on effective aid from Germany.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

The Populist Movement in the United States
By Anna Rochester

An illuminating study of the origins and economic background of the Populist movement, and its historic significance as one of the first anti-monopoly coalitions in the United States.

Price: Paper $.35, Cloth $1.00

Labor Parties: 1827-1834
By Alden Whitman

A new study of labor's initial steps in independent political action during the formative years of workers' organizations in the United States.

Price $.25

Wendell Phillips
By James J. Green

An evaluation of the life and work of the great Abolitionist leader and his struggle for Negro emancipation, free education, women's rights, etc.

Price $.15

Coming!

THE STRUGGLE FOR AMERICAN FREEDOM
By Herbert Morais

A history of the first two hundred years, covering the period from 1607 to 1801.

Price $2.25

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS
P. O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Books on American History

The Rise of the American Nation

1793 - 1824

By Francis Franklin

A major new study of the formative years of America's rise to nationhood, the development of events and forces leading to the War of Independence, the democratic victory over Federalist reaction under Jefferson's leadership and the national victory over foreign aggression culminating in the War of 1812. Franklin also describes the beginnings of the rise of industrial capitalism and the political realignments of 1824.

Price $2.00

•

"Builders of the Nation" Series

Edited by Dr. Philip Foner

Abraham Lincoln: Selections From His Writings

Lincoln's writings on democracy, slavery, the Civil War, and labor, arranged and with an introductory essay by Dr. Foner.

Thomas Jefferson: Selections From His Writings

Jefferson's writings on democracy, slavery, education, world affairs, etc., arranged and with an essay on his life and work by Dr. Foner.

George Washington: Selections From His Writings

Washington's speeches and letters on national unity and the revolutionary War of Independence, on education, religious freedom, etc., arranged and with an essay by Dr. Foner. Ready next month.

Paper 25¢ — Cloth 85¢

•

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED